WITHDRAWN

The LEAVEN *of the* SADDUCEES

ERNEST GORDON

Pacific Bible Seminary Library

Kenneth Knox

288 Gordon
G662ℓ The leaven of the Sadducees
c.2

11290

LIBRARY
PACIFIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

The Leaven of the Sadducees

or

Old and New Apostasies

By

ERNEST GORDON

"We trust the Unitarian doctrine and practice to leaven the inert mass of archaic religious opinion. The penetration has been accomplished and the leaven has worked wonderfully."—*Twentieth Century Christianity,* CHARLES W. ELIOT.

"Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them."—ACTS 20:30.

LIBRARY
PACIFIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

CHICAGO
THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASS'N
826 North La Salle Street

Copyright, 1926, by
ERNEST GORDON

Printed in the United States of America

G662L
C.2

11290

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I. THE UNITARIAN DEFECTION IN NEW ENGLAND - - 7

The "capture" of the churches from Puritanism. The reaction from Unitarianism to Episcopalism. Dr. F. D. Huntington. The statement of an ex-Unitarian, F. S. Child.

CHAPTER II. CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND UNITARIAN MISSIONS - 21

The rise of Christian missions in New England contemporaneously with the Unitarian apostasy. The Unitarian mission in Japan and its collapse. The failure of the Harvard mission in China. Drs. Sunderland and Bacon on the inability of Unitarianism to initiate missions and the reason. Depreciation of Christian missions by Drs. Johnson, Eliot, and Peabody. Unitarian missions to evangelical heathen at Chautauqua, in State universities, and among Lutheran Scandinavians.

CHAPTER III. THE GOOD WORKS OF UNITARIANISM - - - - - 36

Unitarian accomplishment in philanthropy and good citizenship. The evangelical roots in Unitarian personalities and philanthropies. The Unitarian families in Boston and their great wealth. The extent of Unitarian giving as compared with that of the Christian churches. Unitarian contributions to educational pioneering slight. The "capture" of Antioch college. The moral character of Harvard and its graduates according to Harvard testimony. Unitarian neglect of Negro and Indian. The slavery issue and Unitarianism. How Unitarianism has blocked the movement against alcohol.

CHAPTER IV. UNITARIAN SCEPTICISM AND UNITARIAN SCHEMES 66

An examination of Unitarian literature. Emerton, Chadwick, Dole, Eliot. Its anti-Christian character. The official publications of the American Unitarian Association. The drift into atheism. Dr. Dietrich and other "humanists." Attempts of President Eliot to break the way for Unitarianism into the Federal Council of Churches. Unitarianism in the Massachusetts Federation of Churches and the resulting paralysis. The drive to break down the evangelical tests of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. and to admit Unitarians to their management. Unitarian denunciation of these Christian tests. The Unitarian plan of leavening Christian churches and institutions as stated by themselves. Boring from within. The testimony of Slaten. Staying in evangelical pulpits and "capturing" them for Unitarianism.

PAGE

CHAPTER V. THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION - - - - 101

The Religious Education Association and Unitarianism. Permeating the Bible Instruction in the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. "Capturing" the International Sunday School Association. "Capturing" Chautauqua. Permeating the hymnbooks. "Capturing" the Bible chairs in the colleges. C. F. Kent and his anti-Christian *Life and Teachings of Jesus.* Wild of Mt. Holyoke. Agnosticism at Wellesley. The situation at Smith, Bryn Mawr, Vassar. Fowler of Brown and Peritz of Syracuse. The modernist drive at the state universities. Schools of Religion. Essential Unitarianism as a state religion. The work of the Council of Church Boards of Education in promoting this movement. Inter-denominational university pastorates. Modernist literature in school, college and Y. M. C. A. libraries. Training of modernist instructors and directors of religious education. Other intrigues.

CHAPTER VI. THE LOOTING OF ANDOVER - - - - - - - - - 138

The perversion of the Hollis professorship at Harvard to Unitarianism in 1805. The founding of Andover as an evangelical seminary to take its place. Safeguarding the endowments from Unitarianism. The Andover creed and the Board of Visitors. The great evangelical history of Andover. The five professors break down the creed. Their trial. The decline of Andover under modernist control. The affiliation with Harvard and final merging with the Unitarian school and destruction of Andover's identity. The hypocrisy of Harvard "non-sectarianism." Unitarian taunt songs on the end of Andover. Affiliation of Newton Theological Institution and the Boston University School of Theology with Harvard Theological School. The significance and dangers of these affiliations.

CHAPTER VII. THE APOSTATE SEMINARIES - - - - - - - - 159

The early history of Union and its evangelical usefulness. Its perversion. President McGiffert questions the future life. Non-theistic modernism. Lyman on "democratic theism." Fagnani on "Indispensible faith in ourselves." Ross and the worship of Kwannon. "Conversion by convulsion." Coe's psychological explanation of Christian experiences. Scott and the Gospel of John. W. A. Brown and Spinozism. Union students. How the Baptists sacrificed to provide endowment for Chicago University. Morgan Park Seminary turned over to this University. The Unitarianizing of this seminary. Evangelical Baptists told to begin over again and found their own school. Blind guides to *A Study of the Christian Religion*—Mathews, Case, Smith, Soares. *The Finality of the Christian Religion* by a Baptist free-thinker. Ames' psychological theorizing. Proposals to standardize the ministry by law if necessary. Barring Bible school scabs. Newton's theological toxicology. Unbelief at Rochester. Cross's *Creative Christianity.* Rauschenbusch would democratize God. Starratt of Colgate. The Methodist reading courses and modernism. Crozer's

PAGE

apostasy. Beckwith's "Idea of God." How near can one go to atheism without being an atheist? Youtz and Hutchins of Oberlin. The beauties of Baal worship. Prof. Lake: "God is the unborn life of the world that is yet to be." The Methodist seminaries. Student notes from modernist lectures.

CHAPTER VIII. MODERNIST ANTIQUES, OR THE OLD AND THE NEW ENLIGHTENMENT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 212

Modern criticism and modern theology a recrudesence of that of the eighteenth century. Parallels between eighteenth century deists and present day modernists. Dr. Fosdick and Tom Paine in parallel. Evangelical neo-Straussians. The similarity in attitude, style and phrasing between the older and the present unbelief. The tactics of eighteenth century unbelief as well as its theology borrowed from the past. "Capturing" the divinity faculties and the pulpits. Stealing endowments. Disregarding creedal obligations, modernizing liturgies, mutilating evangelical hymns. Shorter Bibles in the eighteenth century. Emasculating the ritual of the Methodist church. The victory of eighteenth century modernism over evangelical Christianity. Death of religion. Persecution of evangelicals in Scandinavia, Holland, Germany and Scotland by the modernists. The collapse of morality following the triumph of unbelief. The evangelical revival, Hauge in Norway, the Haldanes in Scotland, Beck in Denmark, Schartau in Sweden. The *Revéil* in France and Switzerland. The restoration of Christianity in Germany. The awakening of philanthropy which followed—Wilberforce, Shaftesbury, Fliedner, Wichern, Bost, Grundtvig, Bodelschwingh. Modern evangelical missions.

APPENDIX - 258

Ford Hall Forum. The Fellowship for Christian Life Service. The Andover Decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court (Extracts). The Board of Missionary Preparation a Modernist's Sinecure.

NOTE: Throughout this book "C.R." stands for *Christian Register* (the Unitarian organ); "R.E." for *Religious Education*, organ of the Religious Education Association, and "C.E." for *Christian Education*, organ of the Council of the Church Boards of Education.

The Leaven of the Sadducees
or
Old and New Apostasies

CHAPTER I

THE UNITARIAN DEFECTION IN NEW ENGLAND

UNITARIANISM was not so much a secession from the church of New England as an apostasy from Christ. "It did not set out primarily to create a church," says Dr. E. A. Horton. "It had one and it kept possession of the majority of meeting-houses in this vicinity."[1] It was the Puritan party, the lawful heir of the great traditions of New England, that had to go, leaving all behind. A committee of the Massachusetts General Association in 1836 recorded in a careful report eighty-one cases of ecclesiastical division. Three thousand nine hundred evangelical members withdrew. The property which fell to the twelve hundred and eighty-two Unitarians who took possession of the churches amounted to more than $600,000, a sum representing many times that amount today. Many churches went over *en masse,* taking buildings and endowments with them. This was the case with twelve of the fourteen churches in Boston.[2]

This alienation of property was made possible by the relation of the churches to the parishes in which they were situated. The town contributed to the support of the church and was consequently given rights in the choice of pastors. When the Unitarian crisis came, town out-siders, by uniting with a minority inside the church, were often able to out-vote the majority of church members. So, in the picturesque phrase of Dr. Lyman Beecher, they "grafted heretical churches on orthodox stumps." "This is their favorite plan," he continues. "When the minister dies, some society's committee will be cut and dried, ready to call in a Cambridge student, split the

church, get a majority of the society and take house, funds, and all."[3]

Two or three cases will illustrate the procedure followed.

In the town of Groton there was a Congregational church with a fund of $11,000 for the support of its ministry. The pastor, Dr. Chaplin, falling ill, the town appointed a committee to arrange a supply. This committee brought in a Unitarian minister from Boston, against the protest of the pastor and a majority of church members. In spite of this protest it insisted on its right of control and declared that "it would not be responsible for consequences which should follow in the course of a just, legal, and firm opposition." Dr. Chaplin and his people, in consequence of this threat of forcible resistance, ceased attending church. Written requests for its use were repeatedly refused. A church council, called to consider the situation, after defining the rights of a Congregational church as a corporation, concludes with,

"If we know our hearts, we do not wish to contend from party feeling or for worldly victory, but believing the Bible to be literally and fully the Word of God and that Jesus Christ and His blood can alone redeem the soul from death, we cannot in conscience sit under Unitarian preaching, nor can we be willing to die and leave to our children such an inheritance."

So they went out preferring the reproach of Christ to the woodlots and bank accounts and glebe lands of Groton.[4]

A more famous case because of legal decisions was that of the First Parish church of Dedham. The large majority of the church members were evangelical, but the parish, in spite of protests, forced on the church a Unitarian minister and invited an outside Unitarian council to ordain him.[5] In the council were Drs. Channing and Ware, President Kirkland of Harvard, and other Unitarian notables, who decided that a minister may be ordained over a parish without the concurrence of the church. Thereupon the majority withdrew. Suit was instituted for control of property. The court ruled that under

a provision of the bill of rights of 1780 the parish was justified in electing a minister without consent of the church: that a church had no legal existence apart from the parish and that the property of the church should go to that minority of the church which had associated itself with the action of the parish.[6] By the aid of this far-reaching decision of Chief Justice Parker (March, 1821) Unitarians were enabled to get possession of the churches of Eastern Massachusetts and those who remained loyal to the Puritan faith for which the churches had been established and endowed were reduced to the status of dissenters.

"It cannot be believed," says the historian of the town, "that the inhabitants of Dedham in 1659 who made such exertion to establish a pure church . . . and who would not permit the town to have any participation in the choice of their two first pastors, could ever have consented to such a method of controlling their funds . . . one which virtually gives the parish the power of controlling them in exclusion of the church.

"Of all heresies they probably would have deemed that the greatest which would place the funds given by them under the control of a Unitarian parish to the exclusion of an orthodox church, as has been done."

Mr. Worthington, after this acknowledgment, says of this action: *"It must be justified on revolutionary and not on legal principles."* It was *"rendered necessary by a change of opinions."*[7] Dr. Ellis, the historian of the Unitarian controversy, makes a similar defense. If the courts had decided otherwise "acres of territory and heaps of funded wealth, the lawful inheritance of new generations unfettered by conditions of creed, would have been pledged to obsolete terms and disbelieved doctrine,"[8] disbelieved, be it understood, not by the majority of the church members but by those outside church walls.

Dr. Abiel Holmes [the father of Dr. O. W. Holmes in whose biography is to be seen his fine Miltonic face] was the honored Puritan minister of the First Parish church,

Cambridge. For thirty-eight years he had preached and led the church in the Christian life, cared for the poor, instructed the children, founded libraries for the parish and engaged in all good works. When Unitarianism became rife he discontinued exchange with certain ministers of this point of view. A memorial was drawn up by sixty-three members of the parish remonstrating. Attempts from the same quarter were made to secure a Unitarian colleague for the pastor. The majority of the church members supported Dr. Holmes in his refusal.

The parish then called (May, 1829) an *ex parte* council composed of representatives of six Unitarian churches and voted, "that the First Church of Cambridge has sufficient cause to terminate the contract subsisting between them and the Rev. Dr. Holmes as their minister and this council recommend this measure as necessary to the existence and spiritual prosperity of the society."

The parish, confirmed by this backing, accepted this "result" and voted that "the Rev. Abiel Holmes be and he hereby is dismissed from his office of minister of the Gospel and teacher of piety, religion, and morality in said parish and that all connection between said Holmes as such minister or teacher and said parish do and shall henceforth cease." But a grant was made of three months salary "to said Holmes on equitable principles but not as legal right."

This discarded friend of thirty-eight years was informed by the committee that they "have employed a preacher to supply the pulpit in the meeting house of the First Parish in Cambridge on the next ensuing Sabbath . . . and that your services will not be required or authorized in the public religious services in the meeting house in said parish hereafter."

The congregation and pastor set on the sidewalk in this brutal fashion borrowed the court-house for services, Dr. Holmes preaching from the text, "Think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you." Two-thirds of the members followed their pastor in the organization of a new church, the Shepard Memorial, which now stands on the west

side of Cambridge common. The Unitarian minority was not satisfied with taking the church building but demanded of the church its church fund, poor fund, communion service, baptismal basin, church records, church library, etc., and when these were refused sued for them and obtained them. The actual money which the church was obliged to surrender was $4,000. This church fund had been gathered in contributions at the Lord's Supper. The church plate had also been purchased wholly by church contributions, the parish having had no part in the gift.[9]

It is worth noting that no offer was made to divide the property which a very questionable court decision had enabled Unitarians to lay hands on. Nor as far as I can ascertain was this done in other cases by the triumphant party.

When a generation had passed a writer, apparently Professor Stuart of Andover, described in a compact paragraph the injustice to which the Congregational churches had been subjected by the liberalism of the day. The smart of this injustice was still clearly felt.

"In the progress of this separation [of orthodoxy and Unitarianism] some forty years ago, it sometimes happened that a church and a parish which had long co-operated in the support of public worship could agree to do so no longer. The parish would call a Unitarian minister, the church by large majority would refuse to concur. The parish unwilling to recede from its vote would go on and settle the Unitarian minister and the church in regular church meeting and by a strong major vote would decide to withdraw from the parish. They claimed the right as a distinct and independent body and a quasi-corporate body to withdraw and to carry the records and their property with them; expecting, of course, to leave all parish property behind.

"But the parishes thus left were not content with holding their own property; they claimed also the property of the church. They sued for it and in repeated instances recovered it. The ground taken by the courts, in opposition to all reason

and Scripture, to precedents and history, was that a Congregational church is a mere appendage of the parish; that it cannot exist separate from the parish; that it may think to withdraw and retain its property but it cannot do so; that the few church members which remain are legally the church; or if none remain the parish, may proceed and gather a church which shall succeed to all the rights of the property of the seceding body.

"Such was the ground of these decisions and on this ground church after church was plundered of its property even to its communion furniture and records. We called this proceeding plunder thirty years ago. We call it by the same hard name now. And we solemnly call upon those Unitarian churches which are still in possession of this plunder to restore it. They cannot prosper with it. And we call upon the courts of Massachusetts to revoke these unrighteous decisions and put the Congregational churches of the state upon their original and proper basis."[10]*

*I know of no attempt ever made to filch Unitarian church property from its owners. I judge therefore that it was merely an uneasy conscience, recalling these early nineteenth century confiscations, which dictated the following circular. The policy outlined has been acted on and Unitarian church property is now quite generally protected in this way.

The Protection of the Property of Unitarian Churches

(Circular of the American Unitarian Association)

"It will surely be agreed by all loyal Unitarians that a church property created by the self-sacrifice of past generations or by the energy or devotion of the present generation should not be seriously diverted from its original or present purpose except by the natural process of evolution or progressive change. At present our churches are not thus protected against *capture* for adverse or secular uses." It is therefore proposed "that each Unitarian society wishing to preserve its property for Unitarian purposes give to the American Unitarian Association a trust deed for the property. . . . The trust clause of the deed will provide that in case the society ceases to be a Unitarian church the Association may assume full control of all the property and improvements."

The children of this world are wiser than the children of light!

It may be added that the Unitarianism of the early nineteenth century took care to guard its grip on the college which it had taken over from Puritanism. To this end it secured from the legislature repeated alterations in the constitution of the board of overseers. This board con-

So it came about that in Boston and other towns of Eastern Massachusetts, as Mrs. Stowe has written in a well-known passage, orthodoxy became a "despised and persecuted form of faith. It was the dethroned royal family wandering like a permitted mendicant in the city where it once had held court and Unitarianism reigned in its stead." But though the churches of Boston had passed over to a more or less pronounced unbelief, large portions of their membership were not satisfied after the excitement had died down and the time of reflection had come.

Of Dr. Lyman Beecher, who had come to Boston to rally the evangelical loyalists, his daughter writes, "He had not been in Boston many weeks before every leisure hour was beset by

sisted originally of the governor, lieutenant-governor, chancellors and senators of the commonwealth with the ministers of the Congregational churches in Boston and outlying towns. But as a body constituted after this manner was liable to continual change and Unitarians might not long constitute a majority, an alteration was in due time proposed and effected. An act in 1810 prepared by Chief Justice Parsons provided that the board should consist of president of the senate, speaker of the house and an elective body of fifteen clergy and fifteen laymen *with power to fill their own vacancies.* By this arrangement Unitarians were able to perpetuate their control. The legislature in 1812 restored the old arrangement but that of 1814 revived the act of 1810.

Dr. Griffith, the Congregational pastor of Park Street church, was constitutionally a member of the Board of Overseers. But no notice of time or place of meeting was ever sent him. At length he took his seat. His claim was disputed and a committee was set to consider the case. A majority voted in his favor but the law of 1814 was whipped through the legislature for the purpose of excluding him. (*The Spirit of Religion,* 1829: 478, quoted in Eddy, *The Unitarian Apostasy.*)

How consistently Unitarians boycotted others than those of their connection in the management of Harvard comes out in a *Report on Filling Up Vacancies in the Clerical Part of the Permanent Board of Overseers of Harvard College,* 6: "Between the years 1810 and 1843," it says, "while elections were confined to the Congregational denomination fifteen clergymen have been elected, fourteen from that part of the denomination known as Unitarians. Although the nomination lists have never been without other candidates there has been but one instance during a period of upwards of thirty years of a selection being made from the Orthodox part of the Congregational body."

In 1852 every member of the Corporation was a Unitarian. More than half the members of the Board of Overseers were Unitarians. On the Board of Overseers were ten ministers—eight Unitarian. Of the thirteen members of the faculty eleven were Unitarian, one a Quaker and one without church connection.—Eliot, *The One Hundredth Anniversary of the Harvard Divinity School,* 34.

people who came with earnest intention to express to him those various phases of weary, restless, wandering desire and aspiration proper to an earnest people whose traditional faith had been broken up but who have not outlived the necessity of definite and settled belief. From minds of every class in every circle of society, the most fashionable and the most obscure, these inquirers were constantly coming with every imaginable theological problem from the inspiration of the Bible out through all the minutest ramifications of doctrinal opinion or personal religious experience."[11]

Early Unitarianism in its right wing was much nearer to evangelical Christianity than one would imagine who knows it in its modern phases alone. Emerson wrote of old Dr. Ezra Ripley of Concord [who indeed could say of himself, "I am not sensible of having departed in any degree from the doctrines properly called the doctrines of grace"], "He seemed in his constitutional leaning to their religion one of the rear-guard of the great camp and army of the Puritans." And there were many such. Emerson's own father could declare, "This doctrine of human depravity, whose truth is sanctioned by universal observation and experience is a doctrine of the Christian revelation and he who preaches it preaches Jesus Christ and Him crucified. For this purpose was the Son of God manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil. By his sufferings and death He proves the inherent and unchanging mercy of God, moves sinful men to penitence and reformation and thence expiates their guilt and procures them pardon of sin. He voluntarily laid down his life, took it again and broke the prison of the grave, thence becoming the first fruits of them that slept."

Hezekiah Packard in his last days declared: "I have nothing but Christ to trust to and hope to be clothed with my Saviour's righteousness." When asked if he feared death his reply was, "I do not think much of the King of Terrors; my thoughts are on the King of Glory," and his last whispers were of "Rock," "Redeemer," "Shepherd." The Rev. W. B. O.

Peabody had his Bible training courses which he led from an interleaved Bible. "His preliminary prayer was full of humble entreaties for spiritual aid. Then he opened at the third chapter of John, which he read and commented on, at the same time addressing his hearers on the absolute necessity of being born again." "He seemed," his biographer tells us, "fully and cordially to recognize the death of Christ as the only foundation of a sinner's hope and his later years were more evangelical than the earlier ones." Samuel May was brought up in King's Chapel and he could say of the preaching of Dr. Greenwood, "it contained little or nothing that an evangelical Christian could not cordially subscribe to." "Let no man say when I am dead that I trusted in my own merits. I trust only in the mercy of God through Jesus Christ," wrote Dr. Freeman, Greenwood's predecessor.[12] How world-wide the difference, let us say, from Dr. Edward Cummings, who not long ago in the South Congregational church [the writer being present] referred to our Lord as Joshua ben Joseph and spoke of His atonement as "post-mortem religion";[13] or from Dr. Rihbany who on the following Sunday actually told his hearers that they, too, could say of themselves, " 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' Why not?"

The uprooted feeling, the nostalgia, the craving for spiritual support which Mrs. Stowe describes, was reinforced later by a revulsion and indignation among these moderate Unitarians such as any normal Christian would feel on listening to such utterances. The paradoxes of Emerson, the blasphemies of Parker,* furnished occasions enough for this indignation. The leakage of the dissatisfied from Unitarianism grew

*"The Lord's Supper is a heathenish rite and means very little. Cast away the elements. Let all who will come into a parlor and have a social religious meeting, eat bread and wine, if you like, or curds and cream and baked apples and have a conversation free and cheerful, on moral questions."

"It is folly, even impiety to say that God cannot create a greater soul than that of Jesus of Nazareth."

"It is the same great problem of duty which is to be wrought out by all,—huckster, merchant, lawyer, harlot, minister, poetess, orator, Dinah

constantly. Its main current swung into the Episcopal church, the contention with orthodox Puritanism having been too strong to make easy any reconciliation with the "standing order." "We have seen," said the *New Englander,* Oct., 1845, "Episcopal churches erected almost solely by seceders from Unitarian societies. . . So great has been the movement in this direction that we have heard in Episcopal circles the confident boast that it is the prerogative of that church and her special mission in Massachusetts to recover the Unitarians to the true faith."

This secession was more or less constant through the nineteenth century and was especially marked in the ministries of Dr. Huntington and Bishop Brooks. It can be explained only by the fact of an unsatisfied spiritual thirst and should be set in contrast to the enthusiastic utterances from new comers which appear in the official literature of the American Unitarian Association.*

on negro hill and Jesus on Mt. Tabor. And it is not of such future consequence to us as men fancy whether the tools of our work be a basket or a warehouse, or a mop or a cross."—Weiss, *Life of Parker,* Vol. 1, 155 and 140 and Vol. 2, 504.

To those who know the facts it is a commonplace that Theodore Parker did more than any other man to fill Episcopal churches and to establish them on a secure foundation. C.R. 1910:1182.

*Of these converts to Unitarianism the Rev. Theodore Bacon says: "A considerable proportion of them remain with us but for a time." C.R. 1915:898.

To these devout Unitarians the Age of Reason was as antipathetic as it would be to devout Christians today and their apologist, Dr. Ellis, used to charge with unfairness those who put quotations from Paine and from Unitarians in parallel. But when the time came to erect a memorial to Parker Unitarian opinion had so far changed that the main hall of the building could be given the name of Paine Hall in spite of the fact that Parker had said of him "he is no man for my fancying. . . . He was filthy in his personal habits." At present Paine has attained a sort of Unitarian canonization. Dr. G. Bachelor speaks of "the recipients of his intellectual bounty" and uses the phraseology of the eleventh of Hebrews of this hero of faith and his ilk. ("What shall we say then, the time would fail, etc.") C.R. 1916: 604. An Indianapolis church has recently unveiled his bust. On the wayside billboards of the Unitarian church at Lancaster, Mass., appear, with quotations from Persian and Brahminic Scriptures, sentiments from Paine, C.R. 1915:374, and we are told that Mr. McHale gives "talkettes" on Tom Paine to Unitarian young men's Sunday school classes. C.R. 1915:1150.

Many of the profounder minds in English Unitarianism, notably S. T. Coleridge, F. D. Maurice and R. H. Hutton, the great editor of the *Spectator,* returned to the Christian faith in the last century. Prof. F. D. Huntington of Harvard was the most outstanding figure in the return in New England. "From first to last," says his biographer, "his own denomination conferred on him almost every distinction which official station could afford," but years after he spoke of his departure from it in terms of happy escape. "It is the anniversary of that blessed day in 1860 when H. and G. and A. went with me to Christ Church, Cambridge, in the evening to be confirmed. We were going out from a place of unsatisfying privileges, comfort, and honors, a barren and dry land where no water was, into a country which we had not known save by faith and as it were in dream but promised to us and given to our ancient fathers. As it proved the description of Palestine in Deuteronomy is not too good for it." He had come to the conviction that "Christianity cannot be accounted for on the Unitarian theory of Christ; that the Christian heart needs both consolations and inspirations which Unitarianism, even in Channing and Martineau, does not supply." In a remarkable article in the Forum (June, 1886) he asked [referring to the disintegrating tendencies of Unitarianism], "Is there anywhere in ecclesiastical annals an instance of so swift a plunge downwards in any association of people bearing the name of Christ [by] simply losing hold of the central fact of revelation?"

"Broad room was opened for more extensive relaxations," he continues, describing the course of Unitarianism into stark unbelief. "Individual independence is a rapid but bold rider and drives with loose reins. Institutional Christianity began to be regarded more as a superstition than as a safeguard or an obligation. Ordinances were optional. All beliefs were elective. Any distinctive divinity in Christ, the personality of the Holy Ghost, a sacrificial redemption, a permanent and hereditary disease of sin in human nature needing such redemption

. . . were emphatically, if not passionately, rejected whether as facts or dogmas.

"There would be from a believing past and from many sides sources of God's gracious help, high-toned families, pure lives, encouraging and enlightening preaching, ardent reformers; but it is difficult to see how practically the upshot could be escaped that everybody is to do in this world of temptation, error, and folly what is right in his own eyes."*

A group of Unitarians, turning away from the radicalisms of Theodore Parker, organized on the Boston Back Bay, under Dr. Huntington's leadership, a new and powerful church, giving to it the significant name of Emmanuel, God with us.[14]

Equally striking testimony to the progressive dechristianizing of Unitarianism to a point where it became intolerable to many Unitarians themselves came later from the leading protagonist of Unitarian controversy, Dr. George E. Ellis. The following letter from him [dated April, 1881] appears in the biography of Dr. Phillips Brooks, who himself was baptized a Unitarian.

"Nothing will ever lower my sense of the profound indebtedness, of the obligations of this especial community to that class of persons, clerical and lay, of the last generation, who were known as Liberal Christians, devout, serious, earnest, Bible-

*At the close of his life Dr. Huntington wrote, "I was brought up and was a minister among those who deny the truth of the Trinity. My heart's desire for all such is that they may be saved." *Memoir,* 182. On his 48th birthday he wrote: "How little accomplished. There are those thirteen years in the Unitarian denominational interest. How shall I get them back. Alas, only by trying to prevent others from a like mistake." 206.

Interesting light is thrown on the misgivings which were working in Unitarian minds in some reminiscences of Elizabeth Peabody, prominent in these circles and close friend of Channing. "In the last year of his [Dr. Channing's] life," she writes, "my own mind was drawn to a view of orthodoxy quite contrary to that which I had cherished for years. I began to understand what truths were probably in the eyes of those who had formularized the Athanasian creed. In the first place I thought I saw what the original Trinitarians wanted to express respecting the nature of God and man and what the atonement meant to Luther and Calvin. My mind was very strongly moved with these new ideas and I seemed to seize hold of a philosophy of religion that unlocked and explained mysteries of my own experience which the formulas of Unitarianism did not cover."—SPRAGUE, *Unitarian Pulpit,* 382.

Christians. Their works and services have left an enduring benefaction to this good city and to the college. But with existing so-called Unitarianism I have for many years had no concern. It has left no authoritative basis for religious instruction and institution common to preachers and people. The preacher has for his stock and capital his own individualism of opinion and belief and his utterances are like notes, dependent on his own credit and integrity."[15]

Finally, I would reproduce as an illustration of the spiritual hopelessness which seems to lurk in the background of Unitarianism and which has led so many to flee it, a communication from one who has come out of its more intimate circle. Some years ago I had referred in a paragraph to the saying of the late Prof. Francis J. Child that he always pitied an agnostic as one who had forfeited the happiness of teaching his little children to pray. This quotation brought from Prof. Child's son, Francis S. Child, two letters which expressed his reaction from Unitarianism with a bitter sharpness. "I distrust Unitarianism," he wrote. "I have intimately known its leaders, preachers and laymen, American and English, from the seventies down. What impression have they made on me? Absolutely none. My whole impression of Dr. Hale's preaching and personality for example, is that of emptiness. Without faith it is impossible to please God. If we have not the Son we have not life. C. W. Eliot is a good example among laymen as is John Burroughs, both of whom I have known in public and private life. Pleasant companions, no doubt, and interesting personalities, but to what purpose when their ways are the ways of death.

"I remember dear Dr. Holmes [Oliver Wendell] saying, 'I can see no excuse for Unitarianism to exist longer. Whatever good it may have done the reason for it is long passed away.'"

Then he proceeds to give this personal testimony:

"Father, who was born on Salem Street, Boston, 1825, in his great-grandfather Paul Revere's house, united with the local Methodist church on confession when about fourteen years of

age. When a professor at Harvard about 1850 his letters from then to 1860 to my mother were full of deepest faith and often referred to the Cross in the most devout and sweetly fervent manner. But mother was a Unitarian, her mother own cousin to Dr. Channing, and together they attended the First Parish [Unitarian] church. Prof. F. G. Peabody was their pastor. When I was ten years old (1879) family prayers, regularly held up to that period, were dropped off. Father ceased going to church more than once in a great while by 1885. At his death in my arms in the Massachusetts General Hospital in 1896 he had lost all faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and I, under the same influence, was utterly without hope and in the depths of despair. I was convicted of sin and joined the First Congregational church, Cambridge, on confession of faith in November, 1900. Papa was always an intense lover of the Bible but read it, alas! little after 1880 or at least less and less, except that being professor of English literature he taught the Bible as literature once in three years.

"I ought to say that Unitarianism which ruined papa's happiness and peace and likely his eternal joy and spoiled all my childhood, youth, and young manhood, I have observed to be always deteriorating and disintegrating in its influence and effect, spiritually and morally. I know many instances, especially in the leading families of Boston."

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER I

1. Horton, *Unitarianism,* 5. 2. Walker, *History of the Congregationalist Churches,* 343. 3. *Autobiography of Lyman Beecher,* Vol. 1, 449. 4. *The Rights of the Congregationalist Churches of Massachusetts,* 3 and 7. 5. Walker *op. cit.* 342. 6. Worthington, *Historical Address, 250th Anniversary of Dedham,* 55. 7. Worthington, *History of Dedham,* 126. 8. Ellis, *The Unitarian Controversy,* 427. 9. Alexander Mackenzie, *The First Church in Cambridge,* 196, 189, 194, 195, 198, 203, 206. 10. Quoted in Ellis, *The Unitarian Controversy* (415) from the *Puritan Recorder.* 11. *Autobiography of Lyman Beecher,* Vol. 2, 110, 11. 12. Sprague, *Annals of the Unitarian Pulpit,* 115, 118, 245-6, 290, 498, 504, 489, 172. 13. *The Layman's Answer,* 6. 14. *Memoir of F. D. Huntington,* 153, 366, 361. 15. *Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks,* Vol. 2, 285.

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND UNITARIAN MISSIONS

"He could do no mighty work there because of their unbelief."

IT is a striking coincidence that the Unitarian defection from Christianity coincided with the beginnings of the greatest expansion of Christianity since apostolic days. New England Congregationalists ejected from their churches not only went to work to build others, together with Andover and Amherst to take the place of Harvard. They also pioneered the West and laid the foundatians for the American Board, the greatest spiritual institution which has come out of New England. It is worth while to meditate on what the world at large would have lost if Jefferson's forecast had proved true and Unitarianism become the predominant religion of America.

There would have been no great apostles as Judson and Hamlin and Thoburn and Ashmore and Wells Williams and Horace Pitkin and W. A. P. Martin and Bliss and Greene and Dwight; no great missionary families as the Scudders, the Gulicks, the Schaufflers, the Riggses. Peter Parker would not have opened China at the point of his lancet nor would he have had his great successors in Asia such as Dr. Wanless of Miraj and Dr. Van Allen of Madura. The Doshisha University would have been unbuilt, Robert College never founded on the Bosphorus; there would have been no St. Luke's hospital in Tokyo or Presbyterian hospital in Canton; no great mission presses in Beirut, in Rangoon, in Calcutta, in Shanghai. Thousands of lepers would be rotting in dirt who are now in sheltered homes. Christie and Nesbit and Shedd and Frederick

Greene and Emily Wheeler and Corinne Shattuck would not have championed Armenia and pioneered relief and relief industries among her orphans. There would have been no agricultural missions such as Higginbottom is building up in Gwalior and the missionaries of Nanking University in China. The great Indian famine relief which Hume headed in 1906 would not have come into being nor would there be that chain of Presbyterian mission schools along the Nile. The best friends of Asia and Africa would have spent their lives denouncing dogma in America and the open sores of the world would have run unstanched. I wonder if there is really an honest Unitarian that is not glad that early Unitarianism did not burn over a larger area of American Christianity.

Not that Unitarianism has not made attempts at missions, but between Unitarian mission theory and mission empiry is a deep chasm indeed. " 'Honor all men,' " wrote Dr. E. E. Hale, "makes it easier today for the Unitarian missionary [than for others] to deal with the Ute Indian or with a Fiji islander. They meet not as enemies on two sides of an entrenchment but as the common children of one God."[1] So far theory. But have there ever been Unitarian missionaries to Utes or Fijis? Not to my knowledge.

There was a Unitarian mission to Japan and Dr. Hale and President Eliot were on the platform of the Arlington Street church when its initiation received the benediction of "Jesus, Buddha, and the eight million Japanese deities" from the mouth of young Mr. Fukazawa.[2]* Dr. Clay Macauley, its leader, had high hopes for it. "I am bold to say that the American Unitarians have undertaken nothing of greater importance. . . . I am confident that our mission is distinctly prophetic of an era for the Japanese people as yet unknown, an age of deep spiritual awakening."

*This Mr. Fukazawa was son of the educator Fukazawa who set himself by book and lecture to drive Christianity out of Japan but later, though disbelieving it, still urged its adoption in order to secure Japan standing among the nations. (STRONG, *Story of the American Board*, 354, 357.) The Unitarian mission was closely related to his school.

Later he wrote, "We are probably more widely known in the Empire and receive more attention in Japanese current literature than any other foreign religious body represented in the Far East."[3] The field was an attractive one, free from all pioneering discomforts and with a people accessible to novelties. Mr. Knapp, who spent a year looking over the ground before the mission was established, declared Japan "ripe for the Unitarian gospel" and the Japanese "born Unitarians."[4] Christian missions, which seem to be the only really hopeful recruiting ground for Unitarianism, were well established. A considerable number of Japanese Christian ministers were from first to last picked off.*

Dr. Macauley seemed to have had hopes of the Doshisha University also, that noble institution of nineteenth century New England Christianity.† "The teachers of the chief orthodox Christian college of Kyoto, the Doshisha, though not associated with your mission and [though they] would decline such association are again and again referred to in public print as 'Unitarian.' The changes they have lately been making in the direction of a liberal administration of their institution have brought upon them our name."[5]

But there was not money enough in Unitarian Boston to finance its few representatives in Japan.‡ Dr. Macauley was obliged to make the humiliating confession,

*Prof. Onishi, Prof. Kishimoto, Rev. T. Murai, Prof. Abe and Prof. Toyosaki "all coming to us through orthodox Christianity." In 1921 Mr. Abe reported to the Unitarian annual meeting, "Unfortunately there is retrogression in our church. Eighteen years ago it seated 400 and was crowded. Today Sunday attendance averages between 60 and 100." C.R. 1921:511.

†Certain of the Doshisha faculty adopted Unitarian views and the trustees in 1897 took out of the constitution the unchangeable article that the ethics taught there should be based on Christianity. The Prudential Committee at once engaged counsel to recover the trust funds which it was claimed were thus being perverted. As a result of this pressure a new board was elected and a new constitution adopted reaffirming the Christian character of the school.—STRONG, *History of the American Board,* 361.

‡Yet Dr. Van Ness of the [Unitarian] Second Church, Boston, tells us that "it is easier to raise thousands for the Japan Mission than hundreds for work in the South End of Boston."

"There is but little money called for for our work, not nearly as much as many of our parishes expend each in its narrow limits. And yet that small amount has been growing smaller from year to year for several years past and now the question has become serious with your board of directors as to whether they are justified in their endeavor to uphold longer this part of their burden. At the board's last meeting a sum sufficient to carry the Japan mission only six months longer was voted and the whole future thereafter left open and overcast with doubt. . . . Must it be that now when we have almost everywhere gained recognition among the Japanese as the chief visible embodiment of the spirit of the times, as prophetic of true religion and ethical insight, our voice shall be stilled?"[6]

Yes, so it was to be. American Unitarianism sold out its property and retired, notwithstanding the fact that according to Dr. Macauley "as a whole Unitarianism has had a wider and deeper-reaching effect than any other of the spiritual or religious agencies that have been brought into Japan."[7] Mr. Hawkes, an English Unitarian, wrote at the same time of a Mr. Meikawa, a Japanese preacher of great eloquence trained for the ministry among the Presbyterians, who had seceded to Unitarianism. He had pledged English Unitarians for his salary of £50 annually but found it impossible to collect "this trifling sum" in the English churches.[8]

"The honored president of the National Conference" is quoted as finding in this Unitarian mission "a crucial experiment." I think that to be the case and that Unitarianism is here shown to be marked for failure in any attempt to build up a following among distinctly non-Christian people.

At the 250th Anniversary of this church he said: "Hereafter we can listen with respect and sympathy to far-off missionary appeals for help to those who believe our chief duty is to spread the gospel in Japan, in the hills of India, in Hungary, among the Molokans of the Trans-Caucasus; but to one and all such appeals we can kindly but firmly return the answer, 'This is not our direct work; not the especial thing for which we were founded. We wish you God-speed in your efforts but we cannot turn aside to do your particular work.' "—*Twenty Years of Life,* 59 and 63.

Other Unitarian enterprises abroad need not detain us. "Singh of India, missioner to the common people, a great Unitarian pioneer" is the subject of an obituary notice in the *Christian Register,* March 6, 1824. Mr. Singh seems to have been a devoted man, an ex-Methodist and "trained in an orthodox mission school" who built up a little Unitarian community in the Khasi hills, Assam. But the backing received from English and American Unitarianism has been so slight that the mission has been unable "at any time to support more than one paid worker among all these churches and schools" and Mr. Singh, "great Unitarian pioneer" though he was, was obliged to make his living as a clerk while carrying on his work as missionary.

One ought, perhaps, in this connection to mention the defunct Harvard Medical Mission in Shanghai. Yale has a great educational and medical plant in Changsha, Hunan; Oberlin, an educational mission in Shansi; and Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania and many other colleges support Christian missions abroad. The Harvard mission was framed on similar lines.

President Roosevelt was its early president. Rich graduates, Mr. James Stillman and others, were on the board. China was chosen as its field and the Harvard Medical School of China, Inc., officered by an imposing list of Harvard men, was its first venture. It was to give China modern medicine together with "the Christian religion in its simplest forms" to use President Eliot's words concerning it. But its career as a mission institution did not last long and it was finally turned over to the Rockefeller China interests for nursing and eventual adoption.*

*The Harvard Mission is still in existence in a small way and finances two men abroad. It is perhaps significant that it has not sent them out to do independent or pioneering work but places them in evangelical missions, a rather dubious contribution as the following indicates. The report of the mission for 1922 is before me. One of the missionaries is writing from the Syrian Protestant college at Beirut. He differentiates between the evangelistic and the educational missionary. "The evangelistic missionary pins his faith to sudden change but the educational missionary is usually indifferent to or actually skeptical of

That Unitarianism is a non-conductor of spiritual life is evinced by its failure in this field. It is not merely that it is more comfortable to "huddle closely around the cozy stove of civilization in this blessed Boston" (H. W. Bellows). Unitarianism simply cannot Christianize; cannot go to a degraded pagan people and make new men and women of them. If the Puritan momentum had carried far enough Boston Unitarianism might in a measure have imitated the educational and Samaritan work of American Christianity abroad. But to bring forth little churches of the new-born such as are now scattered by tens of thousands through the non-Christian world and which are its only hope, is absolutely beyond it. Nor has it any sense of responsibility in the matter. A hundred years have passed since its rise in New England and the following is the confession which its best informed student of missions has to make.

"Do we as American Unitarians have any national foreign mission society as most denominations do? No. Are we as a

professed conversion and pins his faith to evolution. . . . No student is required to attend chapel or made to study the Bible." Those who elect to stay away must take a course in ethics and the history of religions with this Harvard missionary. He writes: "In ethics I have tried to show the students that no religion has a monopoly of truth nor can any one church or religion claim to be the sole recipient of revelation and sole channel of God's saving grace." Of evangelism he has a poor opinion indeed. "It must be confessed that such a policy results in failure. Few indeed are the men who come forward and say 'I wish to change my religion' and those few nearly always turn out badly. . . . The 'convert' may, often does, lapse. Evolution takes longer to effect the change but the change is more lasting."

As a result of Dr. Hale's advocacy Ramabai circles were at one time formed in various Unitarian churches. They finally abandoned her. "In later years Pundita Ramabai became more outspokenly orthodox, carrying on a mission not only for educating but also for Christianizing [in the orthodox sense] Hindus. Of course this was a disappointment to American Unitarians. Under such conditions their sympathy with her work and their financial contributions to its support inevitably grew less and less." C.R. 1922:962.

C. H. A. Dall, an American Unitarian, conducted an industrial school in Calcutta for many years. Fortunately he did not have to depend on Boston for his support. "He himself inherited a considerable fortune but spent nearly all of it on his work." (Eliot, *Heralds of a Liberal Faith.)* At his death his five schools were closed and all visible trace of the many years' labors vanished.—*Memorial to C. H. Dall,* 67.

denomination now supporting any foreign missions? Yes, one. [Now defunct]. How many missionaries have we in the field? One. [Now withdrawn]. Have we any women's foreign missionary society? No. Have we any missionary society for our young people? No. Are we training our children in our Sunday schools to become interested in foreign missions? No.

"Have we any students in our colleges and theological schools preparing to go to foreign fields as missionaries? So far as I am aware not one. Do our large and influential Unitarian clubs and other organizations of men follow the example of such clubs and organizations in other denominations and have evenings devoted to foreign missions? I am not aware that any of our clubs ever consider foreign mission subjects. Are our ministers accustomed to preach often on foreign mission themes? I am not aware that this kind of preaching is ever done in our pulpits. Are our churches accustomed to take up regular stated collections for foreign missions once a year or oftener as other churches do? I do not know anything of the kind.

"Are we Unitarians satisfied with this condition of things? Can we look other Christians in the face, can we look the outside world in the face without shame?" (J. T. Sunderland, C. R. 1912:732 abridged.)

What is the reason for this situation? Another Unitarian, the Rev. Theodore Bacon, answers with accuracy: "That which is lacking in Unitarianism is conversion, the coming of a new life," he tells us.

"Should such new life come into our churches there would also come with it a new power to reach others. It is, I think, a rare occurrence at present for Unitarian preaching or Unitarian church activity of any kind to reach out and bring into the religious life those who are consciously engaged in wrong-doing. We have to get the Methodists or some other body to do that for us and then if they become discontented with Methodism or whatever, we try to

show them the beauty of our gospel.* But is it not a little humiliating that this primary work of 'saving sinners' should be beyond our reach?

"Sinners have no special predilection for orthodox doctrine as such. They would do without it if they could. But they do want something which shall give them a new hold on life and that we seem unable to give them. That direct spiritual help which shall strengthen them to turn away from the evil in their lives and lay hold on the good seems unattainable as presented by us. If we could but realize the reality of repentance, of conversion, of regeneration, I cannot but believe that we could reach such men with greater power."[9]

At times one notes a stirring but it soon dies down. The First Unitarian Missionary Conference was held in Boston, Nov. 11, 1913, a century after the founding of the American Board. Dr. Wendte, a participant, described it as "a daring innovation in view of the habitual abstention of Unitarians from foreign missionary endeavor and the prevailing opinion among them that foreign missions are more or less of an impertinence as well as waste of effort and money." The war-horses were all there, Peabody, the Eliots, Dole, Rihbany and W. H. P. Faunce. "The spirited discussions, the devotional exercises, the earnest singing of missionary hymns, lifted the sessions at times to an enthusiasm and fervor not often witnessed at Unitarian meetings."[10] But there it ended.

Two years before at the Unitarian ministers institute at Meadville, Pa., "it was unanimously resolved that at least we thirty or more Unitarians would henceforth try to be ashamed of our selfishness, our small views, our limited interest in others,

*Thus King's Chapel, Boston, has an Italian Mission. Its provenance comes out in this statement of Mr. Tagliatela, the missioner:

"Everywhere [in Italy] you will meet some Italian who has been converted by Italian Protestant missionaries. These good and earnest Italian orthodox missionaries do an excellent work and in a brotherly manner. They open the way to the glorious liberty of the children of God and consequently to Unitarianism. . . . In New York we have a large group of Italian Unitarians formerly members of my Methodist church in that city. . . . Another group is in Philadelphia where I was for two years." C.R. 1917:700.

our narrow thought as to the mission of Unitarianism in the world and would try from this time on to think and act in ways more worthy of our faith.

"And to begin with we resolved to reach out a helping hand at once to our Brahmo brethren in India who so greatly need our encouragement and our aid." The Meadville Conference of the Tuckerman Association was accordingly formed to cooperate with the Samajists "who are trying to do in India much the same kind of religious reform work we are trying to do here only under conditions ten times harder."

"We all said, we cannot do much at first but we are going to begin. Already we have $3.80. Let nobody smile. This is a small nest-egg. There will be more and larger eggs in the nest by and by."[11]

The greatest feat which Unitarianism has ever accomplished was the raising of two and a quarter millions in the drive of 1920-23. But of this not even $3.80 was set apart for foreign missions. President Eliot after a visit to the East called for a million for Unitarian missions. President Taft seconded the call. No nest-egg has been found for the fund.[12] It is too cold in Unitarian Boston. They simply cannot crank the car.

They look enviously at the great missionary super-six, the American Board. Is it possible they could get into it with their bundles of leaven?* For years Prof. E. C. Moore of the Harvard Divinity School has been president of the great organization and it is Prof. Moore who says to Unitarians in a tract of the Unitarian Association, "It is from our own ancestors in the faith that we are separated rather than from one another." Things, too, seem to be going their way. Rev. W. I. Lawrence, erstwhile Unitarian missionary in Japan, thinks that the missionaries there though calling themselves by other names are "in the very great majority Unitarians at heart."[14]

*"If things go on improving at the rate recorded in the missionary annals of our time the day may not be far distant when even a Unitarian physician and teacher might be sent under the auspices of the A. B. C. F. M. to minister to the needs of our fellow-men *in partibus infidelium.*" C.R. 1910:1154.

The Rev. J. Edgar Park, Congregationalist pastor in Newton, would open the car door. "It would be a magnanimous and at the same time practical step toward Christian unity if some of the Unitarian churches as churches would resume their interest in say, the American Board, by contributing as churches to the educational and medical work done by it. Indeed now when so many stations are being occupied by the younger men I feel that it is more and more the case that the actual preaching and teaching of the missionaries of the Board is largely along the line that would be approved by both sections of our faith."

If there are those who would admit Unitarians to the American Board there are others ready to accept the invitation. What a splendid precedent in the history of the Andover endowments! Who else should be the residuary legatee of the missionary gifts of the other great foundation of New England Congregationalism? "There are only five hundred Unitarian churches in the United States and many of them are young and struggling," writes Dr. Wendte. Who would look to these impoverished folk for independent work abroad? "Our denomination as a whole is hardly a century in existence and must still dispute its right to exist. . . . The wisest way for us, therefore, is to co-operate to what extent we can in undertakings already existing which under various . . . auspices perform admirable educational and humanitarian services. Such institutions as Robert College at Constantinople, the American colleges at Beirut, Assuan, and Salonica and others like them deserve our sympathy and modest support."[15]

One kind of contact with heathenism Unitarians cultivate more successfully. The Parliament of Religion in 1893 was chiefly the promotion of Dr. Lloyd-Jones and other Unitarians or near-Unitarians. It was also Unitarian ladies in Cambridge who were the chief financial sufferers from the insinuating Swamis, Yogis, and other adepts who represented Asia there or followed to America in the wake of the Chicago gathering.[16] An extension of this favorite idea of inter-religious comity was

the Congress of Theism planned by Messrs. Wendte and Sunderland but unrealized because of the war. It was taken up with interest by Hindu theists, Reformed Jews, Sikhs, Parsees, theistic Buddhists, Theosophists, Bahaists and some Moslems of India and Syria. This Pilgrim Theistic Congress was to journey around the world holding sessions at various points, Tokyo, Shanghai, Colombo, Calcutta, Delhi, Cairo, Jerusalem and Constantinople. One wonders if the "humanist" or atheist Unitarians were to travel with this "theist" caravan.[17]

Allah is one and Channing is his prophet. Will Unitarian muezzins ever cry their summons from the minarets of Cairo and Constantinople? Hardly, yet we read in the Unitarian organ an account of the visit of one of their representatives, fresh from their school at Meadville, to a professor of theology at the Azhar mosque school in Cairo. "I told him what I was . . . and asked him whether or not the Mohammedans would favor co-operation with the Unitarians. . . . He asked me if besides denying the godship of Jesus we believed in the prophetic mission of Mohammed and in the religious value of the Koran. On receiving an affirmative answer he was completely satisfied and said that he knew no obstacles why the two religious bodies could not work together with the utmost cordiality. He expressed a desire to see our literature translated into Arabic."[18]

"Islam should be looked upon as a sister of Christianity. It is nearer in many respects liberal Christianity than is the orthodox Christian faith," quotes the *Christian Register* from one of its kindred spirits [Prof. Montet].[19] Well, then, is not its place rather in the seminaries of the *ulemas* than in the Christian colleges of the Near East?

Unable to initiate missions themselves Unitarians minimize and even ridicule the mighty movement which is surely transforming Asia and Africa. The ethnic religions are painted in glowing colors. "The cheery Chinaman," wrote Samuel Johnson, the Unitarian hymn writer, "is not bent like a grim theologian over his mediaeval creed; he is erect and cheerful

and genial." His belief that human nature is essentially good is contrasted with dogmas of Semitic origin current in Christianity. "The life of Confucius was perhaps the most wonderful success on record. His death, too, with his concluding words, 'It is time for me to die after a long life spent in faithful service of the highest practical aims,' is more pathetic and more attractive than the cry of the young Jesus, 'It is finished.' The tide of race tendency sweeps on incapable of taking cognizance of these conceptions of a fallen nature and a mediatorial salvation through Jesus of Nazareth. . . . Tens of thousands of Bibles and millions of tracts are distributed but hardly an instance is on record of an appeal for explanation of Scripture. The tracts distributed by thousands at the competitive examinations are apt to serve for wrapping paper in the market of Macao. Missionary publications are scarcely known beyond the little circle of converts. . . . We have by no means expressed our sense of the futility of this business. No fetishism on earth compares with the enormous expenditures of money, machinery, and labor in printing and circulating Bibles among heathen whose utter waste of them is fully equal to the supply."[20]

It was fifty years ago that the Rev. Samuel Johnson of Salem wrote this. He had never been in the East and the great efflorescence which has broken out in China and Korea and India since then was in its budding only. President Eliot had better opportunities for judgment but his eyes are beetle-blind with prejudice. He learned in his Eastern jaunt "that the missionary teaching of the last hundred years throughout the East takes no hold, has taken no hold on the Oriental mind and for just the same reason that the old-fashioned dogmas, tenets of the Christian sects, took no real hold on the minds of our fathers"[21] and his *alter ego,* Professor Peabody of Harvard, after a similar excursion wrote of the Chinese and Japanese, "They have been familiar for ages with doctrines of incarnation, resurrection and propitiatory sacrifice and the supernaturalism of Christian teaching is likely to seem quite insignificant to minds instructed in the Shinto worship of nature and

of ancestors or the vast pantheon and voluminous scriptures of Buddhism. A system of Christian theology or a specialized type of Christian ecclesiasticism is a vain thing to carry to the Far East."[22]

So speak the brave theoreticians of a missionless church.

Five-sixths of the present income of the American Unitarian Association comes from endowments which amount to $3,397,-398. Actual donations from churches and individuals in 1923 totaled $57,704 [from the wealthiest Boston churches—King's Chapel $1,260, Arlington Street $1,886, Brookline First Parish $1,585, Second Church $750, South $900, Church of Disciples $87]. This $57,704 represents the year's *contributions* [apart from endowments] of American Unitarianism to church extension, church erection, missions and all other enterprises of the American Unitarian Association. Its chief work is described by John Haynes Holmes as "maintaining old Unitarian churches whose natural lives are already spent and building new Unitarian churches which cannot maintain themselves."[23] The subsidized "missions" are generally among those who need them least, self-respecting Scandinavian and Icelandic Lutherans ["the founding of these churches is a part of the romance of missions," 71, Report of the A. U. A., 1923]; in college towns, Amherst, Ithaca, Ann Arbor, Urbana and five others for the benefit largely of non-Unitarian students and "at political and commercial capitals" as Albany, Nashville, Pittsburgh, etc. There is also a Unitarian work ["of a definite missionary value"] at Chautauqua, of many years' standing.*

*University pastors at the state universities are ordinarily appointed to shepherd the studying youth of their respective denominations. But there are few Unitarian young people, if any, in many of these schools. When the American Unitarian Association announces that real estate will soon be needed in the neighborhood of such universities as those of Ohio, Texas, Arizona, Washington, and North Dakota, we are safe in saying that its main objective is the constituency of evangelical young people. C.R. 1911;596. When it also announces that a new Unitarian church has been gathered at Austin, Texas, the seat of the state university and that for several years the attention of *the missionary board* in Boston has been fixed on this strategic point, we know pretty well what Unitarians mean by "missions." C.R. 1916:356.

What Christians understand by home missions,—rescue missions, schools for mountain whites, missions among ignorant Slavs and Italians, among Filipinos, Porto Ricans, and other dependent peoples are non-existent. "The Unitarian movement is nearly as old as the Methodist and older than the Episcopal High Church," writes a Unitarian in the *Christian Register,* "but what progress has it made in converting ordinary, ignorant, commonplace busy people from worldliness to holiness? Much is said of the orthodox persons who become Unitarians. Their religious character was formed under Orthodoxy. . . . Social reform is not religion. . . . As a denomination we ought

Prof. J. F. Shepherd of the department of psychology at the University of Michigan, an active member of the Ann Arbor Unitarian church, tells us without embarrassment or circumlocution that *"the most vital function of the Unitarian church in the college town is to furnish a satisfying and abiding faith to those students whose intellectual awakening is cutting them loose from orthodoxy."* "Seats of learning throughout the South like similar institutions in the Northern states," writes the Unitarian minister at Dallas, Texas, "are promising fields for the propagation of Unitarian principles. There are four thousand students in the University of Texas at Austin. *They come from the best families* and in good time after returning to their homes and taking up their duties of life in the natural order of things will be leading citizens of their respective communities. The *same opportunity to further the cause of Unitarianism is present in every university community."* C.R. 1921: 380.

The West Side Unitarian church has been built near Columbia University, the greatest student centre in the world. "Membership will be sought from among the fifty thousand students. . . . " C.R. 1920:822. At the University of Iowa Dr. F. C. Doan has an office directly opposite the campus so that students can drop in and talk with him. C.R. 1921: 545. The Unitarian Laymen's League finances it. "Half of the attendants on his congregation are students." Dr. Doan is a "humanist" as distinguished from a theist and the Unitarian minister at the gates of the University of Nebraska is said to entertain similar opinions. "There is," reports Dr. S. A. Eliot, *"no more fertile field for recruiting* than the college and school towns of New England. The church at Burlington is at the seat of the University of Vermont and Colby University is at Waterville. The University of Maine is near Bangor and Norwich University near Montpelier. The Exeter church is adjacent to Phillips Exeter Academy. At Presque Isle, Castine, and Farmington are the normal schools that supply the teachers for the schools of Maine." C.R. 1919:1162.

T. J. Roberts writes from Chautauqua (C.R. 1920:964), "I am so pleased with *the leavening process going on there* that I should like our Unitarian people to continue with the other denominations in this very important educational work. Mr. Badger is right that the Unitarians

to have missions to teach religion to the benighted, in the city, in the country, on the frontier, among the immigrants and in foreign lands; not to start Unitarian churches among the orthodox but to start personal religion among the irreligious."[24]

But they never will until they make their peace with the Eternal Christ.

have at Chautauqua one of the finest opportunities offered in this country."

Prof. C. R. Bowen in like vein: "There are at Chautauqua ten thousand people and upwards on any one day during the high season. They are all serious, earnest people seeking light. *They are religious people. They are a picked group of precisely the people we would choose as promising hearers of our word.* They go by our open door daily, practically every one of them. *The missionary opportunity is unique.*" C.R. 1911:641. Also on 976: "The majority of these attendants [at Unitarian services] are not Unitarians. They are often attending a Unitarian service for the first time in their lives. . . . Rarely is anyone disputatious; *more common are genuine conversions.* . . . Many join the correspondence Church of Souls or get in touch with the Post Office Mission."

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER II

1. *The Unitarian Principles* (tract). 2. *Our Day,* Vol. 1, 29 quotes C.R. Nov. 17, 1887. 3. Clay Macauley, *Memories and Memorials,* 112, 504. 4. *Our Day,* Vol. 4, 299. 5. Macauley, *op. cit.* 494. 6. Macauley, 501. 7. Macauley, *The Unitarian Mission in Japan.* 8. Hawkes, *Unitarian Mission Work in Non-Christian Countries,* 22. 9. C.R. 1915:923. 10. C.R. 1913:1146. 11. C.R. 1911:784. 12. C.R. 1913:519 and 1917:95. 13. *Our Common Inheritances.* 14. C.R. 1910:634. 15. C.R. 1913:465. 16. C.R. 1911:618. 17. C.R. 1913:1074. 18. C.R. 1920:529. 19. C.R. 1913:956. 20. S. Johnson, *Oriental Religions*: China, 57, 855, 849. 21. C.R. 1914:439. 22. C.R. 1914:59. 23. C.R. 1912:254. 24. C.R. 1924:180.

CHAPTER III

THE GOOD WORKS OF UNITARIANISM

> The devotion of the Unitarian denomination to good works seems to be its chief distinction from other denominations.—President Eliot at the Ninety-ninth annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association.

"UNITARIANS have never taken any interest in the business called carrying the Gospel to the heathen," says the President of the American Unitarian Association. "We have found overwhelming need for our limited resources in work that lies nearer at hand."[1]

What has Unitarianism accomplished at home?

In the way of citizenship and philanthropy much. One recalls its gracious services in the Sanitary Commission during the Civil War [H. W. Bellows, Jeffries Wyman], its leadership in civil service reform [G. W. Curtis, Dorman B. Eaton], in the women's movement [Miss Anthony, the Blackwells, Mrs. Stanton], in the peace movement [E. E. Hale, Edwin Ginn, the Meads] and pre-eminently in the antislavery movement. It has furnished certain notably useful citizens to the nation. One thinks of that fine and competent social worker Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, of the services which Gen. Barlow rendered in the fight on the Tweed ring, of Peter Cooper's philanthropies, of the Baldwins, father and son, of Alfred T. White, pioneer of tenement-house reform. Of these personalities Unitarians are justly proud. "Unitarianism has been the characteristic exponent of the American theory 'by their fruits ye shall know them,'" a Unitarian minister has lately declared.[2] The claim is a large one and at least applies to such rare souls as Samuel J. May and S. G. Howe and Mrs. Lowell and Dorothea Dix. President Eliot makes similar affirmations.

"The Unitarian faith leads directly to broad social effort to promote human welfare. This is a natural issue of the Unitarian faith. We have not been chiefly concerned about personal salvation. *We have taken to heart the command to love one's neighbor as one's self.*"[3]

If President Eliot had a wider knowledge of the life of American churches he would hardly care to lay claim to any primacy in good works for his own household. It should also be pointed out that Unitarianism has been indebted for its leadership in social movements largely to the churches which are "concerned with personal salvation." That its pulpit leaders have in large proportion come from these churches is often remarked by Unitarians themselves.* Hardly less notable this other obligation. Second generation idealism seems not altogether common in the Unitarian body.† Its idealists are far too frequently naturalized into it. Dr. Bellows once remarked, "Liberalism cannot break the connection which history has established between [it and evangelicalism] nor get rid of the blessed inheritance of faith and experience delivered to her by the church of the last centuries."[4]

*The graduates of the three Unitarian divinity schools "entering the Unitarian ministry in any one year do not suffice to take the places of the ministers who die during the same period. It is still true that our churches depend for leadership chiefly upon ministers who have been trained in schools that represent the traditions of orthodoxy. Many of the men who come to us from other fellowships are of the highest quality but the Unitarian churches can take no satisfaction in the situation until they cease to be parasitic in this all important matter of ministerial leadership."—Dr. S. A. Eliot, *Annual Report of A. U. A.* 1923:32.

†"The genius of our denominational life seems to run to the practical application of religion to social and national issues. . . . *But at least three-fourths of the religion we apply was generated in orthodox communions. If our source of supply from other denominations were cut off we should be extinct in a generation. We should have no religion to apply.* If we are to win and hold the respect of America we must rediscover for ourselves the springs of power and inspiration and learn to generate our own spiritual resources. . . . I have worshipped with many groups of religious liberals from the Atlantic to the Pacific and have often been amazed to find that they have completely lost the power of intensive devotion. Many of our meetings are held without prayer. . . . Our people are spendthrifts living on the capital of the past, on the prayers of generations departed."—E. J. Bowden, C.R. 1924:156.

This was more obvious a hundred years ago than at present. That Abou Ben Adhem of old Boston, Dr. Joseph Tuckerman, was one of the seven "ministers at large" [three Unitarian, four Evangelical] who cared for the poor of the city in the early years of the nineteenth century. His careful and intelligent records of poverty and unemployment were the beginning of systematic charity in its modern form and his personal service to the poor a thing even more attractive than system. His life fed on the words of Christ. "The New Testament," he writes in a letter, "as often as I open it or think of it becomes to me glad tidings of great joy. I cannot think of Jesus but with the sentiment, 'Thanks be to God for his unspeakable gift.'" Years after his death his copy of White's *Diatessarion* [a harmony of the Gospels] was found with the words on the fly-leaf, "This has been my daily manual. It has been to me for light and strength and solace and peace. When at home it has long been my custom to read it every morning that I might take a lesson from my Master before I went to the ordinary duties of the day and when I have traveled it has been my guide and my treasury on the water and on the land. . . . I account all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord."[5]

There is the authentic note of Christ's own.

Dorothea Dix, the great friend of the insane, who laid the foundation for their institutional relief in the United States, was of evangelical parentage. Of her inner life her biographer says,

"With her the day always began with four or five o'clock in the morning when on rising she secretly set apart the first hour for her religious devotions. In the most hurried time of work or travel she would never intermit this habit, feeling that when frayed in spirit through pressure of care the virtue had gone out of her, she must utterly faint and utterly fail but for refuge in this mount of prayer. God was her present help in time of trouble. . . . Religion was the breath of her life. . . . Those who heard her when she would call together the nurses in a

new asylum to speak to them about their sacred duties, say they never listened to such moving speech from human lips. Her auditory would be wrought to mingled tears and exaltation as though in their merciful vocation the divine privilege of the very call of Jesus to be eyes to the blind and feet to the lame had descended to them from out of the heavens."[6]

Garrison was son of a Baptist mother who evangelized in the Baltimore shoe factory where she earned her bread and he himself was as a young man a convinced evangelical Christian.[7] The early numbers of the *Liberator* were full of Biblical language and spirit. When later he was charged with infidelity he wrote: "I esteem the Holy Scriptures above all other books in the universe and always appeal to the law and the testimony to prove all my peculiar doctrines. I believe in an indwelling Christ and in his righteousness alone. I glory in nothing here below save in Christ and in Him crucified. I believe all the works of the devil are to be destroyed and our Lord is to reign from sea to sea even to the ends of the earth; and I profess to have passed from death unto life and know by happy experience that there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit."[8]

Channing was as a boy converted in a revival in a Congregational church in New London, Conn.[9] Theodore Parker says of his mother in a recently published letter [C. R., April 10, 1924]: "She was a woman of rare piety who took pains to lay the foundations of the character I was to build upon the Rock of Ages. . . . Few men have had so good a religious training as I . . . I was brought up on the Bible." Edward Everett Hale's connection with Puritanism was not immediate but both his grandfathers were Puritan ministers, Enoch Hale of Westhampton being spoken of by him as "dreadfully orthodox." His own mother's Unitarianism was of a type that could be nourished by Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Dying,* her favorite religious book.[10] The remarkable social work Dr. F. D. Huntington did in the South Church as Dr. Hale's predecessor [for it was he who organized in the southern wards

of Boston the Provident Association which gradually extended to the rest of the city] is clearly a fruit of the lofty Christian character of a mother "who was nurtured under the influence and within the fold of the Trinitarian church."[11]

John Pierpont was brought up a Calvinist and attended in his early days the ministry of Lyman Beecher. Noah Worcester, pioneer advocate of international peace, was in early life a Congregational home missionary in New Hampshire and never moved far from what that implied theologically. Adin Ballou, "practical Christian Socialist of the Hopedale Community," was bred a Disciple. Both Lydia Maria Child* and Samuel G. Howe were born before the rise of Unitarianism and hence were presumably bred in the Puritan discipline. Dr. Howe when remonstrating because there "was no Bible, no prayer, no praise" in a Unitarian service, speaks of his early superstitious regard for the Bible (*Journals and Letters,* Vol. 12:471). Julia Ward Howe's father was an Episcopalian of Puritan type, one of the founders of New York University and a foremost promoter of church building in the then distant West; also president of the first temperance society ever organized in America. It is not hard to see where his daughter's humanitarianism and interest in education had its springs. A. Bronson Alcott also came out of Episcopalianism.

William Cullen Bryant, Free Soiler and opponent of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, was brought up in the Presbyterian faith and in later life divided his connections between Presbyterianism and Unitarianism. "No one," says John Bigelow, his biographer, "ever recognized more completely or more devoutly the divinity of Christ."[12] The Massachusetts war governor, John A. Andrew, was of evangelical parentage; also Horace Mann. Frank Sanborn was brought up among the Congregationalists of Hampton Falls, N. H. Francis W. Bird was in early life as Congregationalist active in Boston city missions. Theodore D. Weld was converted under Finney's preaching and trained

*"She was the outgrowth of New England theology, traditions and habits,—the finest fruit of these."—Quoted by WENDELL PHILLIPS in *Letters of Lydia Maria Child,* 263.

as a Congregationalist minister. Susan B. Anthony was of Quaker parentage, Mrs. Stanton of Presbyterian. Antoinette Brown Blackwell was a Congregational preacher educated in Oberlin. Lucretia Mott, closely identified with Unitarianism, was brought up an evangelical Friend. Mary A. Livermore was baptized and trained in the First Baptist church, Boston; Lucy Stone among the Congregationalists delivering the first plea for women's suffrage ever made in her brother's church at Gardner, Mass. Col. George H. Putnam, leader in New York city reform movements, was in early life member of the First Baptist church, New York.

George T. Angell, leader in the movement for the humane treatment of animals, was son of a Baptist minister. Samuel J. Barrows has described the Baptist meeting-house of his early years and this background goes far to explain his later usefulness. His wife and co-worker was, before marriage, a Congregational missionary in India. Charles G. Ames before he pioneered associated charities in Germantown as a Unitarian wrote the early state prohibition law of Minnesota and edited the first antislavery paper of the state as a Free Baptist minister.[13] Jasper L. Douthit, of whom Unitarians speak as "a second Oberlin," was Methodist bred, as was Dr. Robert Collyer, the patriot leader of Civil War days in Chicago. Dr. Edwin D. Mead, prominent in the peace movement, was of a Methodist family and studied for the Episcopal ministry. The Rev. C. F. Dole, also active in the cause of international peace, came out of a Congregational manse as did Charles H. Levermore. Owen Lovejoy, opponent of child labor, was once a Methodist minister. Thomas Mott Osborne, prison reformer, is of Quaker family. William Pryor Letchworth, the founder of the Craig and Sonyea colonies for epileptics, was born into Quakerism in 1823. Edwin Ginn, A. D. Mayo, and Starr King emigrated from Universalism into Unitarianism.

The limb which Channing sawed off from the trunk of New England Christianity had much fruit on it. It was the same fruit as that which ripened on the other branches and was nour-

ished by the same Puritan taproot. These reformers and philanthropists were of the same great family that produced H. W. Beecher and Wendell Phillips and Elihu Burritt and Elijah Lovejoy and John Brown and Mrs. Stowe and Charles Loring Brace and Horace Bushnell and William E. Dodge and Mark Hopkins and Alice Freeman Palmer and Timothy Dwight and Mary Lyon and Frances Willard and Neal Dow and O. O. Howard and General Armstrong and Cyrus Hamlin and Leonard Bacon and Grace Dodge and Graham Taylor and C. C. Crittenton.

It must always be remembered in making any attempt to evaluate the philanthropic activities of Boston Unitarianism that its social and financial control of the city during most of the nineteenth century was fairly complete and its economic resources very great indeed. In 1850 Boston's assessed wealth exceeded that of New York. It was the greatest shipping port of the country. Indeed William Gray was the largest ship owner in the world, Wm. F. Weld and Co. and Ezra Weston following closely after. Great fortunes were built up in the China trade by the Russells and Perkinses, the Forbeses, the Waleses, the Coolidges, the Lowes, the Sturgises and the Cushings; in the Singapore and Penang trade by the Tuckermans; in the India trade by the Wigglesworths and Tudors; by Augustus Hemenway in the Valparaiso trade and in Cuban sugar.

The Thorndikes and Crowninshields early profited by privateering to get together large properties. The Amorys inherited much of the great Green estate made by starting plantations in Demerara, stocking with slaves, and selling out at a profit. For two generations the ground rents of Boston came in steady flow into the pockets of Unitarian families,—the Shaws, Parkmans, Searses, Welds, Brookses and Inches. Fortunes were made by the rise of values,—on Beacon Hill by the Joys, the Masons, and H. G. Otis.

In 1881 there were sixty-one national banks in Boston. In the great banking firms of Lee, Higginson and Co. and Kidder,

Peabody and Co. have been grouped such representative and intermarried Unitarian families as the Lees, Jacksons, Cabots, Lowells, Higginsons, Kidders, Thayers, Winslows and Peabodys. The cotton manufacture of New England has enriched the Lowells, Appletons, Amorys, Coolidges, Walcotts and Lawrences. The Shaws and Bigelows and Agassizes have drawn great incomes from Calumet and Hecla and Anaconda copper mines.

Railroads, too, have contributed to Boston wealth—the Union Pacific built by the Ameses and C. F. Adams, the Michigan Central by the Forbeses and Thayers. The Burlington and the Atchison systems were both financed and constructed by Boston promoters and the Mexican Central to a certain extent. In 1880 Boston capitalists held 340 millions in securities of these Western roads and 120 millions in the railroads centering in their own city. To recount the extent of Boston investments in New England industries, power, traction, and gas companies, Chicago real estate and office buildings, General Electric, United Shoe Machinery, American Tel. and Tel., Southern cotton mills, and what not, would carry us far afield.

Now this wealth was for two generations preponderatingly in Unitarian hands and is probably to a certain extent still so. One would have thought that a little of the great fortunes made in the Asiatic trade might have returned to the East for educational and hospital pioneering. Not a rupee ever did. Almost as little did the continuous incomes from western mines and railroads help in the task of planting churches and schools and colleges in the West. The apothegm "Unitarianism stands for the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man and the neighborhood of Boston" is literally true in its last term. These opulent Unitarians adorned their city as their residences, built its art museum, financed its orchestra, endowed its university, library, and general hospital, and gave considerable sums to charities. The public spirited traditions of Puritanism survived in them to this degree. When one however looks for a rich

institutional life in Boston under the name and fostering care of Unitarianism one is on the whole disappointed. The yearbook of the Unitarian Association for 1924 under the title of philanthropic agencies has four items which represent the actual survival of formal denominational charity after a century of exceptional opportunity.

The Boston Young Men's Christian Union has an admirable summer outing department carried on at an expense of $22,711 in 1924. Its general work for young men is excellent if not very extensive. The Children's Mission to Children expends $63,333 (1922) of which $14,131 comes from donations, the rest from investments and other sources. The North End Union is a social center with sewing classes, school of printing, baths, dances, debating clubs. At the Norfolk House Centre there is extensive social work for which Unitarian churches are chiefly responsible and a less extensive settlement work at Hale House.

Much more than this I cannot find.

Charles F. Barnard, the most effective social worker of Boston's nineteenth century, was the real initiator of the institutional church and the god-father of the Boston childhood of his day. But Boston Unitarianism with all its wealth never properly backed him and when the Old South [Congregational] church began a similar work he wrote with a touch of bitterness,

"The embarrassments, debts, and deficiencies of more than thirty-two years occur to us with force and chastened delight as we observe the different and better fortune of our noble compeer. . . . We know of no martyrdom to compare with that which waits upon the sight of human suffering without adequate and perpetual means in one's hands for its relief. . . . The Old South is rich to be sure. . . . So are other churches, other communities that we might name."[14]

The greatest of all Unitarian philanthropists, Dr. S. G. Howe, made the same complaint. His work for the blind seems to have been constantly in financial want. "There were

times when he had to put forth all his powers to obtain the money needed to carry on the work. In 1858 he wrote: 'The annual expenses of this institution have been for many years greater than the income.' "[15]

In the seventies of the last century there was a Methodist hot-gospeller and foe of rum who with great hardihood bought James Freeman Clark's old church on Indiana Place from its Unitarian owners. The price, $20,000, he toilsomely collected by lecturing throughout New England. During his life time he carried on his church single-handed and at death willed it to the Unitarian Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, hoping that they would develop some ministry there.[16] For years it languished. Then Methodism resumed control and today there is in the Church of All Nations with its attendant industries the busiest social hive in Boston.

There have been, as Unitarians rightly explain, important Unitarian contributions to the general charitable work of the city. The Associated Charities, the Perkins Institute for the Blind, the McLean Asylum, the General Hospital, the Boston Provident Association were largely of Unitarian promotion and have no doubt benefited from Unitarian wills. Calculations in the Memorial History of Boston (Vol. 4:667) of gifts to public charity from 1800 to 1845 come to $4,739,293. This represents the gifts of all citizens. From the same source (669) we get material which may serve as basis of denominational comparison.

From 1825 to 1881 Unitarians expended about $1,500,000 *of which $500,000 came from Boston* through the American Unitarian Association and three other Unitarian societies. The receipts of the American Board for substantially the same period *from Boston alone* were about $2,000,000 and the American Board was but one, if the greatest, of the Congregational organized interests.

When one recalls that the Unitarian defection carried off not only the church and educational plant but also the wealth of Eastern Massachusetts these figures are significant.

The Boston Federation of Churches prints the financial statistics of the churches of Greater Boston in its *Bulletin,* April, 1923.

Number of Churches	Communicants	Parish Expenses	Outside Benevolences	Percentages of Benevolences to Parish Expenses	Totals
Baptist, 101	41,319	$786,230	$416,965	53%	$1,203,195
Congregationalist, 127	49,299	963,289	485,438	50%	1,448,727
Episcopalian, 96	36,637	900,434	284,472	31%	1,184,906
Methodist, 101	31,344	450,074	313,357	70%	763,431
Unitarian, 56	21,986	388,616	101,319	26%	489,935

The per capita gifts for benevolence are: Baptist, $10, Congregational, $9.80, Episcopalian, $7.07, Methodist, $9.99, and Unitarian, $4.60.*

Has the wealth of Boston Unitarianism given us large philanthropic foundations like the Peabody Fund, the Slater Fund, the Jeanes Fund, the Phelps-Stokes Foundation, the Sage Foundation, the General Education Board, the Carnegie Foundations? Yes, one: the World Peace Foundation, whose founder, Mr. Ginn, came to Unitarianism from another church. Have there been in its membership really large-scale givers such as the New York Presbyterian group, Anson G. Phelps, Wm. E.

*The budget for benevolences of the First Presbyterian Church, New York, was in 1924, $101,021. This was for home and foreign missions, education, boys' clubs, hospital fund, day nurseries, etc. It amounts to somewhat more than the fifty-six Unitarian churches of Greater Boston together contributed to benevolences in the preceding year. The average annual benevolences of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church for the last five years were $134,038. This all passed through the church treasury and does not include the large contributions of members through other channels.

The recent Unitarian endowment drive which brought in something under two and a half millions in three years [i. e., $800,000 yearly] is, as far as I can find, unique in the history of Unitarianism. But the Seventh Day Adventists in 1923 alone raised nine millions for religious purposes [$41.45 per capita]. Of this $3,224,000 was for foreign missions and of this again $1,392,000 came out of the Sabbath schools. *Chiesa pregante chiesa pagante!* The membership of the Adventist and Unitarian bodies is approximately the same. The Adventists have no wealth. This represents their normal yearly giving. *They* are the ones to turn to if one wants a high standard of giving.

Dodge, John S. Kennedy, D. Willis James, Morris K. Jesup, John Crosby Brown and the rest? Have there been Boston Unitarians who have literally stripped themselves of their millions as D. K. Pearson did for Christian education or as John Center Baldwin did in an earlier day? Or in humbler circles does one hear of Unitarian "tithers" or of anything corresponding to the sacrificial giving which brings, one knows not whence, $600,000 annually to the work of the Christian and Missionary Alliance?

Ungracious questions, but how otherwise than by making them can one test the truth of utterances such as the following?

"Unitarian views of God and man *are more effective than any other* toward right living, good works, public spirit." C. W. Eliot to the Hawthorne Club, Bowdoin College.[17] "We can without confusion submit the record of the contributions Unitarians have made to the reforms and charities which bless modern life." C. G. Ames.[18] *"Let us in all modesty boldly suggest that the fundamental idea of our churches is unique as compared with any other religious organization . . .* the historic religions and churches have never been directed with singleness of aim toward the actual realization of the kingdom of God in this world." C. F. Dole.[19] Julian C. Jaynes writes: *"Christianity primarily aimed to improve the social life of humanity. . . . Now Unitarianism claims to be the direct heir of this beneficent impulse. . . . They are ever ready with hand and purse to serve their fellowmen. . . . They stand in the front rank* of those who are endeavoring to secure for men the widest culture, the sanest philanthropy, and complete justice."[20] A correspondent in the *Christian Register* (1915: 343) writes: *"We are a race of philanthropists giving millions annually to every kind of beneficent or preventive agency."* The Rev. Dr. Sunderland: "There are no people in the world that give more generously for schools than Unitarians."[21] *"Unitarians' wealth,"* we are told by Dr. E. A. Horton, *"has flowed into the church treasuries of all denominations.* Hardly one good enterprise has failed to elicit

response from our laity even to the detriment of our own financial welfare."[22] M. J. Savage declares that, "Unitarianism indicates a growth of the human heart, a higher manifestation of that humanity which we call specifically humane, tenderness, pity, compassion, love, sensitiveness to that which is right, to that which is just;"[23] and the Rev. W. I. Lawrence in a similar lyrical flight describes Unitarianism as *"the flowering of Christianity,"* and the heart of both Christianity and Unitarianism to be the words of Jesus, "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."*[24]

I cannot find that Boston Unitarianism has either pioneered or financed education in the country at large to the extent which is often supposed. Certainly it has given generously to Harvard where its own boys have had their schooling. Outside Massachusetts two educational institutions have received their largess. Washington University, St. Louis, was established under the lead of Dr. W. G. Eliot, a Unitarian minister of that city. Most of the funds were locally raised, chiefly in his church. Two Boston subscriptions, one of $47,000 from Nathaniel Thayer, the other of $40,000 from Mrs. Hemenway, are to be noted.[25]

Antioch College, Ohio, was, as its name suggests, founded by the "Christian Church." It had at the start a checkered financial history and was finally subsidized by a Unitarian gift of $100,000 on condition that all theological qualifications in trusteeship and government should be abandoned. The Unitarians denied any desire "to have the college exclusively on

*It is not altogether easy to estimate the extent of Unitarian philanthropy and there seems to be wide divergence of opinion regarding it. Mr. Salter of the Society of Ethical Culture writes: "There has not been a man to my knowledge among Unitarians who has addressed himself to the social question in the spirit of Channing." (C.R. 1910: 260.) The next entry in my notes is from Mr. W. M. Backus: "There is not a city in which there is a Unitarian church that its members are not found leading in the work of public benefactions." (C.R. 1910: 293.) I judge that the truth would be that with much that is creditable Unitarian philanthropy has not been notable considering wealth and self-imposed abstinence from the missionary and educational programs which characterize the life of the Christian churches of the country.

any terms," wrote Dr. H. W. Bellows. "They were truly anxious to retain the characterizing control of it in 'Christian' hands. . . . They felt that the less formal their possession of the college, the larger legitimate moral and intellectual possession they might have of the 'Christian' mind. *What they wanted was the chance of giving away such educational experience, such liberalizing influences as they possessed.*"[26]

Horace Mann was made president and soon brought the institution to a high level of efficiency. But the alliance proved an unnatural one. Mann's letters indicate that he, too, was interested in denominational infiltration. "In all this great West, ours is the only institution of a first-class character which is not directly or indirectly under the influence of the old-school theology. . . . Our college, therefore, is really like breaking a hole in the Chinese wall. It lets in the light of religious civilization where it never shone before. Think of this great state with more than two millions of inhabitants and only one Unitarian society!" He looked on the "Christian sect," as his biographer says, "as the only conduit through which unsectarian education could flow into the West. . . . The Universalists had as bad a reputation among the orthodox as the Unitarians *and therefore could not be thus used so safely.*"*

One can see how this *arrière pensée* would sooner or later alienate the owners of the college and its denominational constituency. Mann was at last obliged to write: "The last sands of Antioch College are running out. Unless we can have some wholesale instead of retail donations the institution sinks . . . *and the cause of liberal Christianity and a free-thought education expires* for an indefinite time for all this valley of the West."[27] He had identified himself by church connection with

*After the death of Mann, E. E. Hale wrote: "We expect to reestablish Antioch College under our own men and to lure into the ministry . . . men enough to run our enlarged machinery." Dr. Hale also speaks of the possession of Antioch as involving "the moral and spiritual direction of the public education of the state of Ohio and for that matter of the neighboring states."—*Life of E. E. Hale,* Vol. 2, 7 and 267.

the "Christians," a step to which his friend Theodore Parker took strong exception in view of the "moral contempt Mann felt for the absurd and debasing theology of the 'Christians.' "[28]

He who sups with the devil needs a long spoon. The "Christians" have today no college in Antioch. In the college promotional literature its president is described as "of Quaker antecedents." He is actually vice-president of the American Unitarian Association.* Unitarian shibboleths are dominant in this literature. "Antioch holds the way to truth lies through sincere, open-minded inquiry, not through an unquestioning acceptance of dogma and creed. . . . Comparatively few young people are interested in traditional theology. They have decided that the authority of tradition is not an adequate basis for religious belief. . . . Mr. Morgan deprecates religious formulas." There are religious discussion groups. "We all talked about Buddha, Zarathustra, and Confucius, comparing their doctrines with the laws of Moses and the teachings of Jesus as freely as we discuss the base-ball score."[29] President Eliot endorses the college's present drive for a million and H. Van Loon dispenses history of a sort in its classrooms.

The Unitarians are "the natural planters of higher education in this country" according to Dr. Bellows.[30] The two above mentioned enterprises [with Reed College, Portland, a recent private foundation] represent the chief results of their efforts outside Massachusetts. In Massachusetts individual Unitarians established Clark University and Radcliffe College. Cornell is also claimed by them as Ezra Cornell was an expelled Quaker

*President Arthur Morgan writes of himself: "I grew up in the Baptist church. . . . When I ceased to believe the Bible infallible I found the bottom had not dropped out of the universe. When I doubted the deity of Jesus the structure of the world remained intact; when I began to question a personality called God chaos did not begin. . . . As to immortality I observe that life continues and grows finer and more abundant. What but aggravated selfishness would insist that it be my particular composite of consciousness that continues." Ours "is an impersonal universe." "I see no evidence that a Friend behind phenomena is directing the life urge toward any predetermined goal." C.R. 1918:1048 and 1923:1066.

Mr. Morgan was recently made president of the Unitarian Sunday School Association.

with Unitarian sympathies.[31] *As a corporate body, however, Unitarians have never pioneered education as other churches have done.* The institutional poverty of Unitarianism is illustrated in the secondary education of New England. The great schools of this grade are either Puritan; Andover, Exeter, Williston, the Northfield Schools and some dozen others, or Episcopalian; St. Paul's, St. George's, St. Mark's, Groton. Unitarianism is represented by Procter Academy in New Hampshire: "poor and situated in a poor country but keeping alive the lamp of liberal culture and sincere truth-seeking," as President Eliot tells us.[32] But why after a century of Unitarian wealth should it be poor?

Harvard has been the pride of Unitarians and is fairly entitled to be considered an expression of their spirit. What do those who know it best say of it?

President Eliot thinks it stands pre-eminently "for service."[33] If he means efficient *paid* service one can readily believe it but it would be a bold thing indeed to connect *sacrificial service* in any way with the college or its graduates. Prof. Wm. James, lecturing at the University of Chicago some years before his death, took a less flattering view. After expressing his disillusionment regarding the moralizing power of education he continued: "I have been a citizen of Cambridge for many years and in my time there has been in Eastern Massachusetts no enterprise of public or private rascality that has not been organized or led by a Harvard graduate."[34]

Just what called forth this remark we do not know. Prof. James' occasional vehemence is well remembered and this may perhaps pass as an illustration of it. A cooler and more accurate judgment is that of Henry Adams who knew Harvard life *au fond.* "Harvard college was [in his education] a negative force. The absence of enthusiasm was all that Harvard College taught. In effect the school created a type, not a will . . . leaders of men it never tried to make. The Unitarian clergy had given to the college a character of moderation, what the French call *mesure.*"[35]

This *mesure* is little else than a lack of idealism and wholesome moral initiative. A recent Oberlin publication, *A History of Honor,* illustrates what I mean. From this school moulded by the spirit of President Finney more than a thousand men and women have gone out as missionaries. Twenty laid down their lives in Shensi during the Boxer days. President R. B. Hayes said of Oberlin's work for negro emancipation that the college was "at the head of every forward march in the great conflict against slavery." Oberlin men and women at the time when Phillips was denouncing Harvard as "an infliction" fired the anti-slavery conscience of the whole Middle West throughout which they taught winter times in the district schools. Oberlin was the first college to admit students regardless of race. In 1923 Harvard Jim-Crowed the freshman dormitories and blackballed the Jew. The Anti-Saloon League was organized in the Oberlin library and when in desperate financial straits was saved from dissolution by the personal subscription of President Fairchild. Of Harvard's part in the Committee of Fifty I have spoken elsewhere.*

When a student of alcohol intrigues I was often struck with the way in which Harvard men were directly or indirectly

*"Would any young enthusiast on fire for a new reform be crazy enough to go to Harvard College for countenance? If so he must be *very* young and will soon learn better."—*Wendell Phillips,* (Life) by Carlos Martyn, 527.

In an address to the Harvard alumni in 1903 Prof. James referred to the venal quills of Harvard:

"Some of Tammany's staunchest supporters are Harvard men. Harvard men, as journalists, pride themselves on producing copy for any side that may enlist them. There is not a public abuse for which some Harvard advocate may not be found." — *Memories and Studies:* The True Harvard, 352.

The first students showed their aggressive tendencies by going out in scores to temperance "raisings" and by gathering Sunday-schools in destitute neighborhoods. . . . Oberlin students were abused and cursed in neighboring towns because of their antislavery opinions. At times terrible mobs greeted them. The signposts to Oberlin were bespattered with mud and shot up. On the Middle Ridge road six miles to the north there stood, at a very recent day, a board directing to Oberlin not by the ordinary index finger but by a full-length picture of a colored man running with all his might to reach the place.—J. H. FAIRCHILD, *Oberlin, Its Origin, Progress, and Results,* 26-27.

serving the interests of that basest of organizations, the U. S. Brewers' Association. Koren, its arch-intriguer, was not trained there but he had intimate connections with leading Harvard personalities. [It was also a Harvard overseer, Sedgwick '95, who continued to publish the Koren articles in the *Atlantic* as *bona fide* science even after he had been informed of the writer's relation to the brewers.] Oppenheim '88, was the bibliographer of the U. S. Brewers' Association. Stone '94, the son of the manager of the *Associated Press,* was in full [clandestine] control of their publicity interests and met a wet death on the Lusitania when going on a wet errand for the brewers to European capitals.[36] The wettest of machine politicians, Penrose '81, the Republican boss of Pennsylvania, and Barnes '88, the Republican boss of New York, were both prepared for their life work at Cambridge. Nor does this exhaust the list.

"The influence of Harvard College was beginning to have its effect," says Henry Adams of himself. *"He was slipping away from fixed principles."*[37]

Further, we should remember the official attitude of the university of which the Adolphus Busch building gives ocular evidence. Busch was a St. Louis brewer who for a generation provided the saloons and brothels of the Southwest with alcoholic gaity and corrupted the politics of the same section with his incessant slush funds [*The Brewers and Texas Politics*]. When the corner-stone of the Germanic Museum was laid the Appleton Chapel choir led the procession of which the brewer's wife and the Harvard faculty formed the nucleus. A Harvard professor described Busch as "a doer of great things and warm-hearted lover of mankind, a soul too joyous and active ever to grow old." On the building's *façade* Goethe's words look down with ironical smile:

> Es ist der Geist
> Der sich den Koerper baut.

"What a shabby place Harvard is," remarked Dr. Phillips Brooks to Percy Grant, possibly with the architecture of the

yard in mind. One could hardly find fault with the architecture of either the Germanic Museum or Andover Hall. But oh, the moral shabbiness they summon up!

The moral energy of Oberlin was the child of Oberlin religion; the flaccid conscience of Harvard, Unitarianism run to religious nihilism. Of this nihilism one gets an interesting expression in a recent commencement address on religion by a Harvard senior. Harvard students, he explained to the assembled commencement-gathering in Sanders Theatre, "do not deny the idea of God as a ruling force in their lives. Nevertheless they find no place for it in their daily thoughts. When a temptation arises it is not the idea of God, who with a firm hand guides their steps aright, *but rather a faith in the ideals of manhood and duty inculcated at Harvard.*

"We can go still further. There are many men, they are a well-known type, who are spiritual in their tendencies, who have with great care and thought worked out a religion for themselves and who still find no support in the thought of God. Yet they, too, have a more vital religion than most conventional believers. *It is solely a creation of their own. In studying many-sided Harvard they have studied life and developed a life religion.*

"So it is with Harvard men whether we know it or not. *We all form our ideals of life in an atmosphere of Harvard personalities. These ideals either constitute our whole religion or are at least the foundations upon which a more conventional superstructure may be built. This common religious basis is what we mean by Harvard's religion and it is this which unifies all Harvard men even as Christ by his personality still unifies all Christian denominations.*"[38]

There is no reason to regret, then, that Boston Unitarianism was too niggard to start schools in the West and that Yale rather than Harvard became "the mother of colleges." It was to the evangelical Congregationalism of New England that the country owes Marietta College, Ohio; Wheaton, Knox, Illinois, and Rock Island colleges in Illinois; Beloit and Ripon Colleges

in Wisconsin; Olivet College, Michigan; Grinnell College, Iowa; Carleton College, Minnesota; Washburn College, Kansas; Duane College, Nebraska; Drury College, Missouri; Colorado College, Colorado; Yankton College, South Dakota; Fargo College, North Dakota; Whitman College, Washington; Pacific University, Oregon; Pomona College, California, besides numerous academies.

The American Missionary Society [Congregational] was a merger of anti-slavery mission groups formed because of the neutrality of the denominational boards, the oldest being the Amistad Committee organized in 1839. By 1860 the Association had 112 missionaries. Berea College, Kentucky, was its first college. As soon as the Union armies entered the South its teachers and missionaries opened freedmen schools in Washington, Hampton, Norfolk, Cairo, Newbern. In 1866 its annual income had reached $253,945 and its workers numbered 525.

Atlanta University was founded in 1867. In the same year Howard University, Washington, which has now 3,000 students, was started [in a prayer-meeting] in the First Congregational church, Washington, under the leadership of General O. O. Howard. In 1868 General Armstrong in cooperation with the Association laid the foundations of Hampton Institute. Then followed Fisk University at Nashville, Talladega, Tougaloo, Straight, and Tillotson colleges for the blacks, with other institutions, *seventy-eight in all.* So did the old theology of New England pioneer education among the freedmen as well as on the frontier.

"If our churches had seen their opportunity at the end of the Civil War and taxed themselves $100,000 for education in the South we should be nearer today to the demonstration of our religious thought to America." So remarked Dr. Dole in a speech at the General Unitarian Conference of 1913.[39] What a confession! I know about the devoted work of Mr. Baldwin as trustee of Tuskeegee and the gifts from Mrs. Hemenway to Hampton and the excellent labors of Calhoun

Colored School, Alabama.* But are these theoretical protagonists of "social Christianity" proud of the fact that this last institution with an endowment of $139,950 [more than half of which I discover on inquiry has come to the school from other than Unitarian sources] represents practically all their denominational work in fifty years for the uplift of nine million black Americans? The New England Freedman's Aid Society which Miss Crocker and Miss May promoted for the Unitarians was carried on "as long as it possibly could be kept alive." It was started in war-time but Boston purses soon wearied giving. When the war closed "in the sanguine hope that the fourteenth amendment had sufficiently secured the rights of the negro and that the school system of the Southern states would give him equal opportunities of education with the whites, the New England Freedman's Society closed its work." *Memoir of Abbie W. May,* 23 and 368.

For the Indian, Unitarianism has done even less than for the negro. When James Tanner, a mission worker of the Baptists, passed into their fold they undertook to support his enterprise but were unable to raise $4,000 annually. When Unitarianism broke away from Puritanism it took with it, with its other spoils, the Society for the Propagating of the Gospel among

*During its first eight years the Tuskegee Institute received $5,000 annually from Unitarians and in more recent years $10,000 annually (Cooke, *Unitarianism,* 339.) The Shellbanks Farm [valued at $10,000] was presented by Mrs. Hemenway in '79; the King's Chapel Hospital in '86. Hampton was founded by Congregationalists. Its president and vice-president in 1924 were Unitarians and there are two other Unitarians on the board of trustees. The student body meets in forty classes Sunday mornings for Bible study. *Their textbooks are from the University of Chicago Press.* No Unitarian would object to these publications. "I fear," said Mrs. Stowe of the Liberator in its later days, "that it will take from poor Uncle Tom his Bible and give him nothing in its place." There is a colored ministers' summer conference each year. More than a thousand ministers have attended in ten years past. Prof. Cadbury of the Harvard Theological School and Prof. Fullerton, another modernist, were teachers in the last course.

"When the question was raised whether these [Unitarian] gifts might not effect injuriously the orthodoxy of the school whose charter had determined that 'its teaching should always be evangelical' Armstrong's reply was unequivocal, 'The Institution must have a positive character. It has. It's orthodox and that's the end of it.'"—Peabody, *Education for Life,* 138.

the Indians and its fund. The old society supported missionaries in Maine, on the Isle of Shoals, on Martha's Vineyard, among the Narragansett, New Stockbridge, Passamaquoddy, St. Francis (Canada) and other tribes. It revived the missionary traditions of John Eliot and his profound sympathy for "the poor soules of these ruines of mankinde." What happier starting point could have been found for missionary expansion! Yet not a soul has been discovered in Unitarianism to continue the work and the income from investments has been applied to general Unitarian interests. In connection with this society John Alford had devised in the eighteenth century a considerable sum "for the spreading of the Gospel among the heathen." This is the base of the Alford professorship in philosophy at Harvard now held by Prof. Hocking, and in no even distant relation to the purpose for which the money was bequeathed. Walcotts and Coolidges and Hunnewells are to be found on the management of this old society but there have been no Whipples or Hares or Sheldon Jacksons in its post-evangelical history. Its seal, "Not by might nor by power but by my spirit," explains its early prosperity and later impotence.

Nor in the past century did the Unitarians of New England to any extent parallel the great home-missionary work in the West which the old theology of New England promoted. Fourteen missionary and Bible societies were organized by the latter in the first ten years of the nineteenth century, and during the first forty years orthodox Congregationalists of Massachusetts and Connecticut planted something like 1,500 churches in the West, contributing in the aggregate about two millions for their support.[40] Nothing came out of Harvard similar to the famous "Yale bands" of Illinois and of Iowa nor did Unitarianism contribute pioneers of the type of Marcus Whitman and Julian Sturtevant and Asa Turner and David Bacon and the apostle to the Nez Perces, H. H. Spaulding, to win the wilderness to Christ.

One little present-day interest of this sort, however, Unitarianism is fostering in the South. It is located in Eastern North

Carolina and consists of two schools, the combined budget of which is about $4,000, raised with difficulty. The neighborhood does not altogether relish the teaching offered it and is even accused of having "boycotted the library." Mr. Robinson, however, "has gone on quietly in the face of abuse and misrepresentation." Baptist and Methodist women at Shelter Neck, N. C., are spoken of much as if they were Hindu mothers throwing babes to Ganges crocodiles. "Oh, you cannot think what it is to us," they are quoted as gratefully saying, "not to *have to* believe that when our babies die they are going to hell."*[41]

The golden age of Unitarianism coincided with the era of antislavery agitation and a shining group indeed was that which it contributed to the leadership of this movement: J. Q. Adams, Sumner, Channing, Parker, S. J. May, Theodore D. Weld, J. A. Andrew, John P. Hale, J. R. Lowell, J. G. Palfrey, S. G. Howe, and J. F. Clarke. But if it gave some of the best minds to the right side it did a like service to the wrong one. John C. Calhoun, most relentless of fire-eaters, was a Unitarian as also was Millard Fillmore, the most plastic of dough-faces; the "cuckoo lips" of Edward Everett were trained in the Harvard Divinity School, and Samuel A. Eliot, the single Massachusetts congressman who voted for the Fugitive Slave Law, got his moral inspiration in the same place.† If Garrison was in general

*Mr. Robinson contributes an article on "Prayer" to the *Christian Register* (1915:61) which may explain this resentment among the North Carolina heathen. "Billions of people," he writes, "have been taught to take their burdens to God in prayer. They have done so and have shifted them from their own shoulders. Instead of that people ought to have been taught that their own good and the upward progress of the world depends upon themselves, that what God does he does in a general way. . . . I find no place for petition in my prayer. The very moment I begin to use the words 'help' or 'grant' or any such words I begin to feel the emptiness of my prayer."

†His son, President Eliot, apparently forgot this when commending Unitarianism to the Japanese in Unity Hall, Tokyo, on the ground that the movement against slavery in America was started and strongly supported by Unitarians (C.R. 1912:745), nor did he recall that he is the grandson of Mayor Lyman of "the broad-cloth" episode of whom Phillips said, "I saw him beg and sue. . . . He never vindicated his

sympathy with Unitarianism so was the bulk of the gentlemen in "the broadcloth mob" who dragged the rope about his waist that October afternoon on Washington Street. For the Unitarians were the people who wore broadcloth in the Boston of 1835.* Certainly Mayor Theodore Lyman was of that persuasion as was Harrison Gray Otis who presided at the meeting of Boston aristocrats that is generally regarded as the prologue to the mob outbreak.

Sumner was a Unitarian but Boston Unitarianism put its social ban upon him. He was obliged to declare when fighting the cause of the slave in the Senate at Washington that only two doors in Boston always stood open to him. When his broken body was brought back to Massachusetts after the assault in '56 the blinds of every house on Beacon Street save those of Messrs. Appleton and Prescott were shut in an ostentatious demonstration of hostility.[42]

Hear Samuel J. May pleading with Channing to come out unmistakably for the movement:

"We are not to blame that wiser and better men did not espouse abolitionism long ago. . . . The scholars, the clergymen, the statesmen had done nothing and did not seem about to do anything. For my part I thank God that at last any persons, be they who they may, have moved earnestly in this cause, for no movement can be in vain. We abolitionists are just what we are, babes, sucklings, obscure men, silly women, publicans, sinners, and we shall manage the matter we have taken in hand just as might be expected of such persons as we are. It is unbecoming of abler men who stood by and would do nothing to complain of us because we manage this matter no better."[43]

office by even attempting to rally a force and maintain order. . . .I saw him consent if not assist at tearing down the antislavery sign and throwing it to the mob to propitiate its rage."—AUSTIN, *Life and Times of Wendell Phillips.*

*"All the *élite* of wealth and fashion crowded the Unitarian churches."—MRS. H. B. STOWE in *Autobiography of Lyman Beecher,* Vol. 2, 110.

Channing answered to the call finally but when he spoke at the meeting summoned in Faneuil Hall to denounce Lovejoy's murder, it was a Unitarian layman, James T. Austin, member of his church and attorney-general of the commonwealth, who declared that Lovejoy had "died as the fool dieth" and that "to free the negroes would be letting hyenas loose."

Parker seemed to have no illusions regarding his co-religionists. "As a general thing," he wrote, "the Unitarian ministers have ideas in advance of the orthodox ministers* while they have generally congregations more mammonish, hunkerish, and worldly than the orthodox. . . . Unitarianism had always a worldly character. Some of their members engage in the great moral movements of the day such as temperance reform and the antislavery movement, but the sect as such is opposed to all reforms." The opposition which he received from those of his own household is well known. When appointed by a vigilance committee "spiritual director of all the fugitive slaves in Massachusetts while in peril" he had to write, "It is a rather queer state of things. Some of Gannett's parishioners attempt to kidnap some of my parishioners. I hide them in my house and guard the doors night and day to keep them safe."[44] It was his fellow churchman, Benj. R. Curtis, Justice of the Supreme Court, who indicted him for "obstructing the process of the United States law," referring to his active opposition to the Fugitive Slave Law.[45]

If anyone doubts the sentiment of Boston Unitarianism of the forties and fifties regarding slavery let him run through the list of the seven hundred names attached to the memorial to Webster in recognition of the Seventh of March speech wherein that statesman had announced his support of the Fugitive Slave Law "with all its provisions to its fullest extent": George Ticknor, T. H. Perkins, Jared Sparks, W. H. Prescott, James Jackson, C. C. Felton, B. R. Curtis, T. B. Wales, J. A. Lowell and the rest.[46] What a rally of the Brahmins! Dr.

*Yet O. B. Frothingham describes the Unitarian ministers as a rule as opposed to the abolitionists.—*Boston Unitarianism,* 197.

Orville Dewey, leading Unitarian minister in New York, went so far from the course Garrison had marked out as to declare his willingness to return his own mother to slavery if it were required to save the Union.*[47]

In the next great emancipation movement, that from alcoholism, one finds a few Unitarian names: John Pierpont, Mary A. Livermore, John D. Long, H. H. Faxon, but these were even less representative of their church than the Unitarian abolitionists. Dr. Bartol, the minister of the West Church, felt called to ridicule the anti-alcohol movement and his paradoxes drew a reprimand from Wendell Phillips which constitutes a fair judgment of Unitarian public morals as far as this particular question is concerned.

"Some temperance men," he wrote, "are surprised and indignant at what they consider Dr. Bartol's prostitution of the liberal pulpit. Such men forget the history of the temperance movement in Boston. When Rev. John Pierpont forty years ago returned from the East he stated in his pulpit in Hollis Street that the first thing he saw there [in Smyrna, I believe] was a barrel of New England rum [N. E. RUM burned into its head in large capitals]. He made this the text for an earnest and eloquent agitation of the temperance question. The richest parishioners were rum-makers and rum-sellers. Their rum was then stored in the very cellar of his church. I will not mention names. Their children continue the manufacture and the traffic. They set to work by reducing his salary, refusing to

*"I must go or choke in this disgraced and degraded community," wrote Dr. S. G. Howe in 1854. James Freeman Clarke preaching on the return of Anthony Burns said, "Especially I blame the Unitarian churches for they have had the especial and rare fortune of having their greatest and best teacher on the side of justice and humanity and they have fallen away from his teaching and his example. . . . *Out of the Unitarian churches of Boston have come those who have done the most in this community to lower its moral sense on this subject.*"—HALE, *Life of J. F. Clarke,* 233.

So Samuel J. May, "Continually in their public meetings the question was staved off and driven out because of technical, formal, verbal difficulties which were of no real importance. . . . It does seem to me that they were pre-eminently guilty in reference to the enslavement of the millions in our land."—COOKE, *Unitarianism in America,* 356.

pay one dollar of it, mortgaging the church for heavy debt and by every means tried to drive Pierpont from the pulpit. Finding this ineffectual they announced their determination to buy up every pew that could be had and then securing a majority of votes, dismiss him from his charge. . . .

"The wealthy rum-sellers of the city, whether attending the Hollis Street church or not, bought pews there, pews they never used, and finally obliged Mr. Pierpont to agree to vacate his pulpit. During the seven years of this hard-fought battle between the penniless, eloquent apostle in the pulpit and the wealthy rum-sellers in the pews, the Unitarian clergy of Suffolk county gave the public to understand that they renounced all ministerial . . . professional recognition and courtesy. With two or three exceptions all the liberal clergy shut him from their pulpits. The rum-sellers taunted him with the fact that hardly one of his clerical brethren in Boston would exchange with him. In his letter of farewell to the ministerial association Mr. Pierpont affirms that this course of conduct toward him was adopted with the intention to drive him from that pulpit.

"Mr. Bartol, therefore, does not prostitute the liberal pulpit. . . . Judged by the example and conduct of the vast majority of the liberal clergy of Boston for the last forty years such sermons as Dr. Bartol has of late delivered are just the preaching for which the liberal pulpit was created and is sustained" [abridged].*[48]

The alcohol question is not a complex question. All that is ever needed for its theoretical solution is a reasonably sensitive personal conscience and an elementary sense of public decency. The whole brunt of the movement in New England has been borne by the Christian churches. Unitarianism until recently consistently stood aloof. Occasionally it has intervened to over-

*Moses Williams, a very rich Boston liquor-dealer, led in this fight on Dr. Pierpont. A large slice of the tainted Williams' fortune went to the endowment of theological education at Harvard and another to the building fund of the Boston [Unitarian] Y. M. C. Union. Dr. Chaney, successor to Pierpont, said of this rum-selling Maecenas, his "praise should be in all the churches for the provision he made for the unsectarian preparation for the ministry in Harvard." C.R. 1918:1167.

throw that which has been painfully built up. Thus in 1867 it was Unitarianism led by its most prominent layman [ex-Gov. J. A. Andrew] which broke down the prohibitory law and turned Massachusetts over for another generation to the vendors of alcohol. Andrew [who beside being the great war-governor was superintendent of J. F. Clarke's Sunday-school] received a fee from the [illegal] liquor interests exceptionally large for the time and defended alcohol and its sale at the State House in a plea which for sophistry and hypocrisy makes one hang one's head for shame. To his support came all the great lights of Harvard Unitarianism: the Bigelows, the Bowditches, the Jacksons, Prof. Francis Bowen, the Rev. F. H. Hedge, Dr. O. W. Holmes. Alcohol was given a scientific exoneration by these authorities which atoned for all its moral delinquencies.[49]

A generation later from this quarter came another and more serious blockade of the anti-alcohol movement, that which found expression in the Committee of Fifty Report. This was led by Prof. F. G. Peabody, Prof. H. P. Bowditch, President Eliot, and others. At the 1922 Founders' Day at Cornell University, Prof. Nicholls reflected on the reactionary spirit of American students and illustrated it by their indifference to the movement which has culminated in the Eighteenth Amendment. Why is it that this toryism should be dominant in the colleges? Simply because whenever American students of the generation past have asked for guidance on the alcohol question they have been directed to the Report of the Committee of Fifty. Here, it has been alleged, is to be found the scientific judgment on the subject in all its phases. The rehabilitation of alcohol as "a food," an intolerant hositility to temperance instruction, scorn of prohibition as an insane counsel of perfection,—these have passed from this six-volume report into the mental makeup of American college students and the student community which [as so often in Continental Europe] should have furnished the leadership of the movement, has in America commonly checked and ridiculed it.

I venture to say that all the economic and hygienic advances which are emerging from National Prohibition have been delayed a decade by the publication of this report by these Unitarian marplots. It is almost inconceivable today that a Harvard group should have gone to the legislature in the name of science to break down a law which taught children in the public schools the hygienic dangers of alcohol, insisting that "temperance instruction could result in nothing but the wide-spread demoralization of our youth" (Bowditch), and urging the legislature "not to offend these little ones."[50]

Channing, sixty years before, had proposed "to end intemperance by improving the physique of the young."[51] Prof. Peabody offered a similar blue-sky program, deprecated "intemperate speech and exaggerated statement," ("There is much to fear from excess of drink but there is also much to fear from excessive statements") declared that the investigations of the Committee of Fifty were not "missionary tracts or moral appeals" but hard-boiled "science" and went on to print the ever-memorable, apodictical sentiment of Dr. J. S. Billings, "The term poison belongs with equal propriety . . . to coffee, pepper, ginger and even common salt" [as to alcohol].[52] President Eliot's treatment of prohibition was colored with the exaggerated language which his colleague censured and was clearly without the substratum of knowledge which "science" is supposed to give. The remarkable social results of prohibition in Maine which lie on the surface in the statistics of state and nation were not even mentioned, but the adjectives of uncritical invective were laid on with a thick brush. The Committee of Fifty Report served as the great theoretical breakwater of the U. S. Brewers' Association and the brewers showed their appreciation by secretly paying one of its chief investigators to be for years their dispenser of beer science to the American public.

The reactionary attitude of the academic representatives of Unitarianism had its political complement in the unremitting opposition to prohibitory legislation of its leading layman in

public life, President Taft. The veto of the Webb-Kenyon bill by Mr. Taft, all its concomitant circumstances considered, was as discreditable as the signing of the Fugitive Slave Law by the Unitarian President Fillmore.

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER III

1. C.R. 1914:539. 2. C.R. 1924:178. 3. Eliot, *The Wise Direction of Church Activities.* 4. Warren, *The Religious Aspects of the Age.* 5. *Annals of the American Unitarian Pulpit,* 356. 6. Tiffany, *Life of Dorothea Dix,* 181. 7. Goldwin Smith, *Wm. Lloyd Garrison,* 9. 8. Grimke, *Garrison,* 303. 9. *Life of Channing,* 21, 74. 10. C.R. 1916:510, 63. 11. *Memoir of F. D. Huntington,* 85, 180. 12. W. C. Bryant, 275. 13. *A Spiritual Autobiography,* 64, 65. 14. Tiffany, *C. F. Barnard,* 152. 15. *Letters and Journals of S. G. Howe,* Vol. 2, 49. 16. C.R. 1918:612. 17. C.R. 1917:379. 18. *Unitarianism: Religion with Liberty.* 19. *Unitarian Ideals.* 20. *Christianity as a Social Force,* 3. 21. C.R. 1912:782. 22. *Unitarianism,* 9. 23. *The Signs of the Times,* 58. 24. C.R. 1913:92. 25. *Washington University, 25th Anniversary,* 33. 26. Bellows, *The Claims of Antioch College,* 14, 12. 27. *Life of Mann,* 488, 431, 477. 28. Weiss, *Parker,* Vol. 2, 342. 29. *Antioch College Bulletin,* 1923, July, April. 30. *The Claims of Antioch,* 19. 31. Cooke, *Unitarianism,* 397. 32. C.R. 1911: 584. 33. *Harvard Memories,* 36. 34. *Religious Education,* 1906, 88. 35. *Education of Henry Adams,* 61, 68, 55. 36. *Report of the Overman Committee,* 777, 1084. 37. *Education of Henry Adams,* 63. 38. C.R. 1914:643. 39. C.R. 1913:996. 40. E. C. Moore, *Our Common Inheritances.* 41. C.R. 1917:134. 42. Pierce, *Memoir of Summer,* 162. 43. *Life of Channing,* 528. 44. Weiss, *Parker,* Vol. 1:381, 270, 271; Vol. 2:110. 45. Martyn, *W. Phillips,* 273. 46. Austin, *Life of Phillips,* 135. 47. Martyn, *Phillips,* 261. 48. Austin, *Phillips,* 326. 49. *Massachusetts Licensing Law Reports,* 1867. 50. *Physiological Aspects,* Vol. 1, 31. 51. *Life of Channing,* 474-5. 52. *The Liquor Problem,* 9, 8, 23.

CHAPTER IV

UNITARIAN SKEPTICISM AND UNITARIAN SCHEMES

> For there are certain men crept in unawares. . . denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ.

IF the early Unitarians were living and should make approaches to the Christian churches of today many of them, no doubt, would be welcomed back. But in the course of the century Unitarianism has so completely repudiated its Christian inheritance that the breach is now irreparable. Never can there be common ground and the *rapprochement* which Unitarianism is now quietly promoting in the name of "unity" and good will must be considered as tactics of a not too creditable order.

A casual glance into current Unitarian literature will make this clear.

Emerton's *Unitarian Thought* is described by Prof. F. G. Peabody as "the most important statement of Unitarian ideas since the popular setting-forth of our denominational beliefs by James Freeman Clarke."[1] It is therefore presumably authoritative. It certainly exhibits the unbridgable chasm of which we speak.

The Unitarian is a "this-side" man. Immortality "is not one of the subjects on which the mind of Unitarians is inclined to dwell." He knows nothing of answered prayer. "They join with all rationally thinking men in rejecting as mischievous superstition the notion that the wishes of men, expressed no matter in what approved form, can change ever so slightly natural laws."* Man needs no redemption. The Unitarian

*Rev. J. H. Dietrich speaks of men as "still flabby from long reliance on prayer." C.R. 1918:585.

Dr. Dole has this of prayer: "The old-world idea of prayer is familiar. . . . The good God moved by prayer would set aside the

believes in "the capacity of human nature to do the greatest things that human life requires." We are in no way dependent on Jesus. "The same divine quality that was in Jesus is also in every man that is born into the world. . . . Jesus' victory was won, as all human victories must be won, after bitter struggles with his own lesser self. . . ."*

The narrative of Christ's birth of a virgin mother is "an insult to motherhood." The word "sin" is in Prof. Emerton's book frequently enclosed in quotation marks as a preposterous notion of the orthodox. "The Unitarian asserts as positively as words can do it the capacity of man to do what is right in the sight of God. . . . To have been bought off from the consequences of his own wrong by the sacrifice of some one else appears a meanness that in common life would be branded with the scorn of every high-minded man."†

Jesus is not the Alpha and the Omega. "He was not the first: he will not be the last." He was but "one in a long line of revealers to men of the law by which they are called upon to live." And to His revelation there seem to be in Prof. Emerton's mind elements of imposture. "He had the power of making a credulous people believe that he was in a highly specific sense the direct agent of God." Doctrines of revelation in the Christian sense are considered absurd and reprehensible.

visible machinery of second causes in order to meet the need of his worshippers. Such is *the childish conception of prayer still held by multitudes whose nurses and mothers have taught them so.* As soon as men begin to think straight, that is to think the thoughts of civilized man, the childish conception of prayer fades away."—*The Religion of a Gentleman,* 81.

*"If criticism should finally render it highly improbable that Jesus on the cross said 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do' we need not on that account be depressed. The reason becomes clear the moment we can answer the question how then did the story of this beautiful forgiving, quenchless love arise? *It is because we ourselves are capable of doing this very thing,* because this goodness, this divine life is struggling to express itself in us and *has led to create our spiritual hero and put into his legend all that we need him to have.*" —Rev. Dr. Dodson, C.R. 1920:560.

†The Rev. Charles Pease says: "The awakened portion of mankind cannot hang around the old traditional band-wagon hoping to catch a tune it can whistle. . . . Far from a slavish imitation of Jesus in

"It would be as mean to ask for truth without work as it is to ask for 'salvation' as the free gift of anyone."

Let us dip into another Unitarian classic.

In John W. Chadwick's *Old and New Unitarian Belief* one meets the customary superciliousness. "That Jesus was a perfect man is an assertion as impossible to prove as that the inhabitants of Mars eat nothing but unleavened bread. . . . Certainly there are things about Jesus in the New Testament which are not helpful to the doctrine of his impeccability, for example, *that dreadful treatment of his mother.*"[2]

"It were a terrible mistake to think that any life, albeit that of Jesus . . . could fully answer to our utmost need. Mankind needs for its salvation all the best that science, art, philosophy, religion, literature and life contain within their boundless scope. . . . To imagine that we have a perfect revelation [of God's perfection] in the provincial life of Jesus . . . is to

order to be loyal to him or of questioning him 'What would Jesus do?' when the real question is, 'What should I do?' . . . *It is Jesusism that we must be done with, Jesusism is to us what Mosaicism was to Jesus, the same overburdened orthodoxy rendered lifeless by traditions and conflicting interpretations.*" C.R. 1917:415.

"What the human race needs is not redemption but education. What the sinful man needs is not redemption but recovery. . . . Redemption is external, something done for us. Recovery is natural, something done by ourselves. . . . *Nothing can be wiped out that has ever been.* Some effect of it must remain. Every thought, word, deed, becomes a cause of something else which in its turn becomes a cause and so on. There is no end of it. *The past lives on forever.* In scientific literalness it cannot be rubbed out."—Rev. Minot Simons, *Redemption or Recovery*, 3-6. *"We have no prayers that beg God to do it all. You cannot think of a Unitarian congregation singing 'Jesus paid it all, all the debt I owe.'* We have no hymns in our books that cry, 'Great God, how infinite thou art, what worthless worms are we.'"—Rev. George Kent, C.R. 1919:181.

Rev. Maxwell Savage thinks of Christianity as an easy way to combine sin and salvation. "The old faith is *at best* magic, make-believe, and involves short cuts and individual salvation. . . . The gods in Valhalla are reported to have feasted and drunk and then risen and fought, hacking each other to pieces; then a little magic and they were made whole again, to resume their feasting and drinking. So it seems to me it has been under the old religious teachings. People could enjoy the pleasures of life, they could live selfishly, they could hack to pieces their own happiness and the happiness of others and then in the name of religion a little magic and they were made whole." C.R. 1915:973.

imagine as unworthily as it is possible for men of natural intelligence to do. . . . It is not less than impious to specialize and isolate him as he has been specialized and isolated in the theology and worship of the Christian church. The first born of many brethren! That he may have been in Joseph's narrow house but in the countless family of God he was not the first. Millions of brethren had preceded him. . . . Today our criticism, science, and philosophy welcome him into the largeness of humanity. *Let us be patient. Let us give him time and thus rescued and restored he shall yet be the object of a more sincere affection.*" Of the doctrines of grace Chadwick says: "Nothing is surer than that could Jesus have encountered [them] he would have said, 'Depart from me; I never knew you.' "[3]

Unitarian Sunday-schools are provided with a Catechism of Liberal Faith by the Rev. Dr. Dole. "What made it easy for early men to think of Jesus as the son of God?" he asks, and the answer comes, "Men had already been used to thinking of their heroes as sons of God."

Q. Did Jesus ever claim to be more than a true man?
A. There is no evidence that he ever made such a claim.
Q. Did Jesus intend to establish a new religion?
A. There is no evidence that this was his intention.
Q. Did he teach new doctrines?
A. No, he appealed to what was already in the thought of his people.
Q. Have other great teachers of religion taught like Jesus?
A. Yes, many of the noblest teachings of China, India, Persia, Greece and Rome are like Jesus' words.
Q. What is the working of sin in the moral realm?
A. Sin, as soon as it shows its really repulsive character, urges men to avoid it and to seek moral health and life.
Q. To what may we liken the lessons of "evil"?
A. They are like the stops, the dots and the dashes in writing which if it went on smoothly in one continuous line would give us no sense.
Q. What gospel may we tell to "the bad"?
A. It is a gospel that the bad life is not man's true nature. It is a gospel that he can forsake and ought to forsake the evil way and that he will then become like a new creature as soon as he lets the electric touch of good will move his soul.[4]

The American Unitarian Association conducts a large propaganda chiefly among members of Christian churches by the distribution of free pamphlets.* There are some three hundred on its list. I suppose it would be fair to say that the purpose of these publications above all others is to break down the central teaching of historic Christianity regarding redemption through a divine Saviour.

It is noticeable that they make no refutation of Romanism, grown to such proportions in Boston, or of Christian Science, the milk sister of Emersonism and bred in the full light of New England's *ville-lumière.* Indeed of this delusion the President of the American Unitarian Association says, "Its general influence is undeniably wholesome"[5] and his father, President Eliot, seems to feel it and other similar sects to be precious auxiliaries in breaking down the hated evangelical faith. In an address on The Religion of the Future, after dwelling with satisfaction on the fact that millions of Americans now find their practical religion in Masonic lodges, granges, Odd-fellows' lodges and trades unions he continues: *"The spiritualists, Christian Scientists and mental healers of all sorts manifest a good deal of ability to draw people away from the traditional churches and to discredit traditional dogmas and formal creeds."*[6]

Any claptrap, then, is looked upon indulgently or with indifference but when it comes to the redeeming work of Christ the whole depth of bitterness begins to stir. In Symphony Hall (Feb., '17) the elder Eliot put this teaching in the forefront of his attack. "We have come hither in mass first to rejoice and give thanks together for our deliverance from all the creeds and dogmas of the older churches . . . *and from those conceptions of Deity which are implied in the words 'propitiation,' 'expiation' and 'vicarious atonement.'* "[7]

In the catalogue of this official literature of Unitarianism one finds in hundreds of numbers perhaps one or two which combat

*Some years a million pamphlets go out from the American Unitarian Association. Local parishes also send them out continually by the thousands. C.R. 1920:157.

materialism and atheism. But on the whole one gets the impression that Unitarians would far rather see Christians lapse altogether, even from belief in God and immortality, than abide in evangelical Christianity. Thus in a recent tract *From Authority to Freedom in Religion,*[8] Dr. Rainsford's autobiography and Dr. McConnell's *Confessions of an Old Priest* are reviewed with delighted satisfaction. But Dr. Rainsford apparently has no confidence in a life after death[9] and Dr. McConnell's account of his spiritual shipwreck is unsurpassed in distressing hopelessness.

"We do not call him *the* Saviour," says Dr. A. M. Rihbany, in one of these official tracts, "because we are certain that humanity has had as many saviours as it has had truly good men and women. . . . No man can be transformed from bad to good vicariously any more than he can be healed from an illness through another's receiving medical treatment for him. . . . Nor would we lapse into the unwarrantable mystical mood and implore the long-departed Jesus to do for us that which we only can and must do for ourselves. We would no more do this than we would pray to Washington and Lincoln. . . . What a glorious world this would be . . . if it were really true that Jesus and his Gospel are the small things of the past, outgrown and antiquated. Imagine a world whose manhood transcends that of Jesus as his transcended the manhood of the cave man."[10]

"We do not believe it possible," echoes E. E. Hale, "for any substituted being to take the consequences of a man's sin or to turn over to him a fixed quota of blessedness."[11]

In an address on the "Religion of the Future" delivered by President Eliot in 1909 to the Harvard Summer School of Theology, there went along with the usual anti-creedal fulmination a practical abdication of the hope of a future life. Yet the speaker describes Unitarianism elsewhere as "a blessed faith to live by and die by."[12]

"To a human soul lodged in an imperfect, feeble, or suffering body," he says, "some of the older religions have held out the expectation of deliverance by death and of entrance upon a rich,

competent and happy life—in short have offered a second life presumably immortal under the happiest conditions. . . . Can the future religion promise that sort of compensation for the ills of this world any more than it can promise miraculous aid against threatened disaster? A candid reply to this inquiry involves the statement that in the future religion there will be nothing supernatural. . . . It is obvious, therefore, that the completely natural quality of the future religion excludes from it many of the religious compensations and consolations of the past. . . . *The new religion will not attempt to reconcile men and women to present ills by promises of future blessedness either for themselves or for others. Such promises have done infinite mischief in the world by inducing men to be patient under sufferings or deprivations against which they should have incessantly struggled.*"[13]

"We leave heaven to the sparrows" was the more compact utterance of Heinrich Heine. What have either Eliot or Heine in common with those whose hearts are fixed on the words, "I go to prepare a place for you"?

President Eliot has for decades delighted to pace in public places defying the armies of the living God. The profound aversion of Unitarians for the Christian church finds expression in his bitter sentences. "*The established and conventional churches manifest little power to promote either love to God or love to their neighbor.* . . . The effective organizations for such pitifully small relief as can be given [for suffering Europe] are for the most part not religious but secular. . . . The effective works of mercy are performed not chiefly by representatives of the churches . . . but by men and women who understand how to get food to the starving. . . . In former times the Christian churches were the almoners for the poor and desolate and the chief works of mercy were carried on by men and women especially commissioned by the Christian church. Now secular societies administered by laymen carry on many of the principal movements for the improvement of society." As representative of these charities Eliot mentions among others the Y. M. C. A.

and the Y. W. C. A., actually asserting that they with hospitals, etc., are supported by people "whose motive power is not derived from the churches." Of course the exact contrary is true.[14]

The speculative opinions of one who can so grossly misrepresent a matter of simple fact are bound to be of small consequence. With this aged Sadducee the old watch-cry about the Fatherhood of God seems to have fallen into the background. "Thoughtful people have dismissed the ideas of God as monarch, king, or lord of hosts. . . . Twentieth century people recognize God chiefly in the wonderful energies of sound, light, electricity, in the vital processes of plants and animals, in human loves and aspiration and in the evolution of human society." So does Unitarianism run into the sands of a pantheistic materialism.[15]

Rev. C. F. Potter revolts against the idea of a King eternal, immortal, invisible, only wise God. "The laymen of the present day recognize that the time of kingship is passed, that it is no longer a compliment to call God, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Those who believe in liberty and democracy and law as essential to human progress are much further on the road to real religion than *the supine suppliants of a monarchic God.*"[16]

Naturally when God is stripped of all might and majesty he no longer invites to prayer. Man becomes the central point in the universe and God "the supine suppliant." Through long centuries mankind has prayed to God," the Rev. C. W. Casson tells us, "to establish right and justice on the earth. But there grows the conviction that through long centuries God has prayed to man this self-same prayer and that the stirring of humanity today toward the attainment of right and justice is but the answer at last to the prayer of God."[17] Nor, according to M. J. Savage, is it good taste to sing hymns or utter words of praise to an infinite being. For it belittles our idea of him to think such fulsome flattery acceptable to him!

The step from such utterances to stark atheism is indeed short and has been taken by a considerable fraction of the Unitarian

ministry. The polite name given it is "humanism." Dr. C. W. Reese [a one-time Baptist] is quoted as saying that "as far as he is concerned the idea of God plays no important part in his religion. . . . Theism is philosophically possible but not religiously necessary."*[19]

Of utterances of this type the Unitarian Dr. Dodson says, "We find that theism is being denied by men who speak as representatives of our movement and who feel that they have a right to do so since we stand for nothing but the liberty to stand for anything or for nothing at all. A speaker at the Western Conference in May declared in a clear, sincere and forceful address that theism must be given up, that the thought of God will have to go, that the long evolution of the idea of God is to end in no idea at all and that the future belongs to an atheistic humanism.

"When a protest was made to the Western secretary stating that such addresses ought not to be given under circumstances in which they will naturally be regarded as representative he defended his action, saying *we stand for nothing but liberty.*

"Consider what this means. A man whose business is largely that of securing ministers for churches repeatedly states that he

*Mr. C. B. Lockwood writes: "Every honest man knows that there is no supernatural regeneration, conversion, or salvation. . . . *As well talk of a supernatural God.* . . . There is no getting religion but by living it and that is man's job and not God's. . . . The kingdom of God is in humanity and unless we find it there we shall never find it." C.R. 1919:317. "Liberalism must remain undogmatic in regard to God. It is building a religion that would not be shaken even if the old thought of God were outgrown." 1920:984. Prof. F. C. Doan, "Our sons will look on humanity as the center of this evolving life. . . . *They will see perfection as a quality that has only just come to pass in the souls of men. . . . The life of the world has become pregnant and divine in humanity. They will name God as the world-democrat, the eternal Man. They will bow down and worship him.* Today he is a man; one day who knows if we shall any longer call him a man? All this is democracy." 1912:984. In *Religion and the Modern Man* Prof. Doan declares God to be essentially and simply just the spirit of humanity. 65. . . . "We and he [i. e., God] being perishable in our origin will surely die the death, will surely subside into the great, the very amorphous, the very cosmic formless beast whence we and he arose."—112, Quoted in C.R. 1910:156.

does not consider theism as essential but is satisfied with men who preach the gospel of atheistic humanism.

"The public will be still more puzzled by a religious fellowship in which atheism and faith in God are preached side by side. And ministers the joy of whose life is to preach a theistic faith naturally cannot be enthusiastic in winning men and women to a church other ministers of which regard that faith as a superstition. . . . The question presses whether the time has not come when Unitarian churches must take some position. . . . If atheism is to be preached in our name no money . . . can save us from the extinction which confusion and negation deserve."[20]

Another ex-Baptist, Mr. Pinkham, declares that these whom Dr. Dodson mentions are "among our most successful pastors. Their humanistic point of view gives freshness and power to their pulpit messages. It is the real God that they proclaim, the wisdom and goodness that dwell in humanity."[21] One of these humanists is the Rev. J. H. Dietrich of the Minneapolis Unitarian church.

"The character of man's life upon this planet" says Mr. Dietrich, "depends not upon divine interventions nor upon prayer but upon what we ourselves are and what we ourselves do." *"We do not believe in that friendly providence which the other religious sects feel sure will establish the Kingdom of God."* Our Unitarian faith "does not need more priests and prayers and holy books. . . . But it does need the never-ending voice of the prophet going up and down the land crying, *'Prepare ye the way of mankind and make its way straight.'"*

"The God of the Christian theology has been taken away. . . . This personal God with the big stick has been taken away. *Not only has the cruel personal God been taken away but the idea of God as a father and loving guide for his children has been taken away.* The many cases in which individuals have to suffer . . . forces us to give up the idea that we are under the protection of an external and beneficent Providence. In its place we recognize a mighty evolutionary force . . . the Great

Unknowable. *Modern knowledge has also taken away the Bible as the Word of God . . . and when you realize what a cruel and foolish Word of God that was you surely are not sorry.*"

"Along with the idea of the Christian God has gone the belief in the power of prayer. *Another thing which has been taken away is the theory that Jesus is saviour alone of humanity. . . . In his place we put a whole shining galaxy of men and women whose smile is the light of the centuries. . . .* And along with belief in endless punishment has gone the theory of the Christian heaven. In its place modern thought has not been able to put anything definite. . . . *So I wish very much for the sake of humanity to stop men from yearning after the great undiscovered future.*"[22]

On the March 13, 1919, cover of the *Christian Register* [nailed to the very masthead] a quotation is printed from another address of Mr. Dietrich and the editor assures us that it represents the opinion of many Unitarians. The need of our day is said to be "a religion which teaches that the hands which have heretofore been raised in supplication must be turned to the tasks about us." The Unitarian Laymen's League declares that "we worship the living God, our Father and our Friend," but the theoreticians of their denomination have got far beyond these naive ideas. "Democratized religion," says E. H. Reeman, "will take God out of the clouds and place him definitely in the heart of man. He walks with the crowds of Chicago by the shores of Michigan as surely as he walked by the shores of Gennesaret. He suffers and triumphs in the trenches of the battlefield as surely . . . as on the cross of Calvary."[23] Of G. W. Cooke who develops similar ideas in *The Social Evolution of Religion* Dr. Dodson says, "It would seem better frankly to avow atheism than to dress it in a religious garb. If there is really no God, if we are orphans, if we are being pushed up and on by some blind, groping, cosmical force instead of being lifted into communion with the Father who is perfect, by all means let us know it and endure it as well as we can. . . . A purely immanential view of God which equates God with

humanity leaves us nothing higher than a humanity to worship. We cannot worship either ourselves or other people."[24]

One finds repeated intimations of atheism in the Unitarian organ. "As God is not the foundation principle of our faith why," asks Mr. J. C. Allen, "insist on conformity. . . . *It would be better if we had to choose between them to believe in Man and not in God than in God and not in Man.*"[25] "Modern religion is frankly humanistic rather than theistic," writes the Rev. Earl F. Cook, "There have been many gods in history which have only cultural reality like Zeus and Thor. . . . Modern religion says that its conception is more mature than these but it does not say that its idea of what men call divine . . . is any more free from decay and death than former conceptions. . . . *Even if the thought of God disappeared and no longer bothered and blessed mankind modern religion would not be hampered in its essential work.*"[26] Dr. J. H. Holmes writes that "*most of us would say we believe in God . . . but some of us don't and they are as welcome to our church as any others.* We regard it as foolish to define religion in terms of a theism-atheism controversy as in terms of a Unitarian-Trinitarian controversy."[27]

And another Unitarian, Mr. Tandberg, remarks sympathetically, "It is intensely interesting to contemplate that in the remarkable experiment of Mr. Holmes and the Community church *we have actually witnessed the establishment of a church without a God.*"[28]

To present-day Unitarians the death of our Lord has no unique or doctrinal significance. In the Unitarian Anniversary Week of 1913 Dr. Edward Cummings proposed the star of Bethlehem as a more suitable emblem for the Christian faith than the cross. The Rev. L. B. Weeks, in reporting the incident, described it as an "outburst of that long-smothered conviction that the gospel of Jesus as against the effete religion of the cross is the only remedy yet known for the world's woe and sorrow."[29] It is not surprising, then, that Mr. Weeks should transform the communion into a memorial for departed

friends and church members. *"The name of Jesus should have only a relative and incidental place in the order of service while the superstitious and traditional incidents which characterize the verbiage of the historic communion should not be allowed to corrupt the simplicity and purity of our holy service."*[30]

In many Unitarian churches the communion is no longer observed; in others rarely. In some water takes the place of wine as if to emphasize the rejection of the precious blood. In some churches the elements are placed on the table, the organ plays "He was rejected of men" from the "Messiah" and the congregation is dismissed without partaking.[31] "The communion," writes a Unitarian minister, "is very repulsive to me. The ideas of sacrifice and atonement are barbarous and inhuman. . . . As liberals in religion why should we commemorate the death of Jesus? . . . *Jesus is not the centre of our religion.* . . . Why do not we commemorate the life of Emerson or Socrates or of Immanuel Kant? . . . Many men and women who might otherwise be loyal recruits and helpful workers in the church are kept from association with the church by the presence of the communion service. As here celebrated four times a year among a small number of people it holds a very precarious position in our forms of worship."[32]

When a Unitarian woman complained in the *Christian Register* that at Easter for three years the Easter Scripture story was not read nor Easter hymns sung, the Rev. G. T. Ashley retorted in an open letter. "Why should the Easter story in the Bible be read as the basis of religious worship in a Unitarian church when all Unitarians look upon it as a myth, and not a harmless myth either, but one that has been a fruitful source of a large part of the world's superstition. . . . Easter is not of Christian origin but pagan."[33] Dr. Dietrich celebrates Christmas "as an old heathen custom. It is a human holiday. I emphasize the natural fact on which this old mid-winter festival is founded not because I love Jesus less but that *I love what is older and greater and grander than Jesus more. . . . Why should we not pay our respects to the sun at this time, the*

sun upon whom man and all living creatures are dependent? For generations we have been taught that we were created and sustained by an unseen hand, but when we face the real fact, whatever power may be back of the phenomena of the universe, the sun is that by which we live. . . . To the early fathers of the race the sun was a living being, a god, and in view of the life he begets in us and awakes anew and afresh each year in the world this seems far nearer the truth than the view that is commonly taken. Why fear then to recognize our dependence upon the sun? Why hesitate to look up and bless him? Why fail to praise him? Our life and all earthly life depends upon him. If he dies we die.

"This is not banishing divinity from the world. It is putting divinity into the world instead of viewing it as the sole occupant of empty space."[34]

Here we have the terminal bud of a paganized Unitarianism. More and more this New England Sadduceeism repudiates the hope of a life to come. Such a personal hope is now often represented as selfish and petty. Its establishment in the fact of Christ's resurrection is altogether gone. In reading the gravestones of notables in the Unitarian necropolis at Mt. Auburn I have been struck with the fact that not in a single instance observed is a line of Scripture to be found on them. That comfort and support has vanished. Further in reading Unitarian biography I fail to find [and this is true of non-Christian deaths generally] a single record of a *triumphant* death-bed. Patience and stoicism, no doubt, but never the sight of the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God. No cries of "victory," "glory," "joy," "heaven," "Christ." D. L. Moody came out of a Unitarian home. Does any one believe that if his life had been spent in expounding the perniciousness of creeds instead of winning souls to Christ the beatific vision of his last hours would have been his?*

I suppose there was never a better friend of man in New

*The Rev. Edward Cummings speaks of heaven as "that ridiculous spiritual roof-garden in the next world." C.R. 1913:779.

England than Dr. Samuel G. Howe, the helper of the blind, the deaf, the slave, the needy. Certainly if human merit could give assurances of life hereafter this Unitarian philanthropist ought to have had it in his last hours. Yet his biographer prints two letters which read:

"It was very dark during a week. I saw no light or hope for this world and was uneasy and unhappy about the next." And again, "Why cannot we two mourning fathers enjoy the hope of reunion in full assurance and faith without the damning doubt. I vainly hope against hope."

Then he goes on to say that *his only stay* is the instinct of immortality implanted in all men.

Another great philanthropist of the time had a firmer rock to build on.

"I am come to that stage of my pilgrimage," wrote Mrs. Beecher Stowe, "that is within sight of the river of death and I feel that now I must have all in readiness day and night for the messenger of the King. I have sometimes had in my sleep strange perceptions of a vivid spiritual life near to and with Christ and multitudes of holy ones and the joy of it is like no other joy. It cannot be told in the language of the world. What I then have I know with absolute certainty yet it is so unlike and above everything we conceive of in this world that it is difficult to put it into words. The inconceivable loveliness of Christ! It seems that about Him there is a sphere where the enthusiasm of love is the calm habit of the soul and that without words, without the necessity of demonstrations of affection, heart beats to heart, soul answers soul, we respond to the Infinite Love and feel his answer in us."[35]

That men should believe in a Christ who is to come again to judge the quick and the dead arouses many Unitarians to a fury bordering on hysteria. The *Christian Register* declares it "a doctrine more heinous and rotting to the soul than polygamy, witch-burning and slavery combined." It calls on "the capable men in the tainted churches to assail this thing with the sublime wrath of Jesus, to utterly destroy it by the flaming truth and

passion of pure religion." Those who believe in it are a religious Ku Klux, night riders, diabolical persons. Its awfulness, its bloody sweep, surpasses the most gruesome pictures of the book of Revelation. At the Ford Hall forum, so it tells us, after calling on the Baptist churches to head off the impending Protestant Inquisition he "aroused his very large audience by his appeal to the churches to save their people from the Second Coming doctrine of force, violence, and fanaticism." Mr. Weil, another Unitarian minister, calls this teaching of our Lord "a mediæval gospel of blood and the devil, a hydra-headed monster that has crawled out of the Dark Ages." And the Rev. Maxwell Savage characterizes it as "the debauching Second Coming enormity."*[36]

* * *

In 1905 a Unitarian delegation headed by President Eliot went from Boston to the initial meeting of the Federal Council

*A chapter might be written on the religious solecisms of Unitarianism, its irreverences and absurdities. I have just dipped into M. J. Savage's *Ministers' Handbook*. In his service for the burial of the dead are quotations from Socrates, the Buddhist Scriptures, Pythagoras, the Egyptian Book of the Dead. Then from Cicero (Roman), Jesus Christ (Israelite), Plutarch (Greek), Thomas Paine (American), Benjamin Franklin (American) and J. P. Richter (German).

Or think of the sense of perspective in this announcement: "Dr. D. will preach at 11 A.M. Subject: The evolution of religious conceptions from Abraham to Jesus and from Jesus to Channing."

Or of the historical intelligence of this statement from Dr. Wendte: "The whole period prior to the Council of Nicea may be regarded as the Unitarian epoch of Christianity during which the predominant opinion, however highly it exalted Christ, stopped short of the ascription of proper deity to him."—*What Do Unitarians Believe?* 25.

Or of the denominational megalomania which in the official story of Jesus for Unitarian Sunday-schools compares John the Baptist with "Starr King who saved California for the Union and whose memorial window is in Dr. Hale's church" and which enlarges on the religious experiences which turned Robert Collyer from the anvil to the [Unitarian] pulpit, comparing them with those which turned Jesus from a carpenter into a messenger of God's truth. In these comparisons Jesus is also placed alongside of "Schlatter, the Denver healer" with no sense of incongruity.—Rev. Florence Buck, *The Story of Jesus*, 11 and 26. "At dinner at Eliza Cabot's," says another Unitarian, "the resemblance of Dr. Channing in countenance to Jesus Christ was a topic of discourse." (E. P. Peabody, *Reminiscences of W. E. Channing*, 118.) Even one with the antecedents of Dr. C. E. Park can speak of "the Unitarian stone which the builders rejected becoming the headstone of the corner." C.R. 1914:157.

of Churches at Carnegie Hall, New York, to ask for the seating of Unitarian representatives. No constituent church of the Council would admit President Eliot to its membership nor would he wish to join any of them. Further, no man in the country has spoken more injuriously than he of the teachings which the churches cherish. The Council refused the application.*

"Unitarians are on all the important committees of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches," wrote the President of the American Unitarian Association, Dr. S. A. Eliot, some years ago. For sixteen years he himself has been on its executive committee. At the present time Samuel A. Eliot is president of the Massachusetts Federation and C. W. Eliot [a freethinker if there ever was one] is Honorary Vice President.

Yet they are not satisfied with local influence. "Liberals," says the *Christian Register* speaking of crypto-Unitarians in the churches, "ought to realize that this [attempt to get into the Federal Council] is their fight and that the sooner they get into it the better. A certain measure of self-respect hampers Unitarians. They have been kicked out of the front door . . . and do not like to ply the knocker very vigorously in an endeavor to get back. But there are others inside who would do well to see to it that Unitarians do get back. Otherwise their time for ejectment will pretty surely come."[87]

There can be little doubt that the presence of Unitarian churches in the Massachusetts Federation has been a factor in alienating important church groups from the Federal Council. Evangelism will ever be looked on as the church's chief mission and this is rendered nugatory by their presence in the Federation. When Dr. Goodell of the Federal Council's Department on Evangelism addressed three hundred ministers in Boston in 1921 the watchful Unitarian editor immediately stigmatized his address as "a reversion to type in evangelical Protestantism."

*It would not be possible to admit Unitarians to the Federal Council under the present constitution, the preamble of which reads, "Whereas in the providence of God the essential oneness of the Christian churches in America *in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour. . . .*"

"Is it possible today in an assembly of ministers of all denominations that the prevailing note should be that mankind is under condemnation for sins and must be washed in the blood that flowed from Calvary? *If this is allowed to prevail liberalism will have to re-enter the lists.*"[38]

The Greater Boston Federation of Churches by article 3 of its constitution at first gave to churches and religious and civic organizations "desiring to be associated with the Federation without necessarily endorsing the Christian basis" associate membership without votes. In 1924 this limitation was broken down and church, synagogue, and neutral charity were given full voting rights. In other words the specifically Christian character of the Federation is abandoned. So we have Keith Theatre services with Unitarian speakers under Federation auspices and "Institutes for parish evangelism" for assorted groups —Congregational-Unitarian, Episcopalian-Greek-Lutheran, etc. "No committee," says the Massachusetts Federation's organ "is more enthusiastic and united [than the evangelistic one] though including representatives of all the denominations from Adventist to Unitarian. . . . Our very denominational differences thus help in finding 'all means to save some.' "[39]

But would one not find it difficult to listen in on union evangelistic services to that leading Unitarian official who, reporting the Northern Baptist Convention of 1922, wrote: "The most objectionable feature of the convention was the obnoxious exaggeration of the uplifted Christ, the abnormal emphasis on the place of the cross in the religious life, the monotonous regularity with which the musical director selected Christological songs."*

The Federation, however, if it is paralyzed for genuine evangelism by the Unitarian intrusion, can at least give religious

*Dr. Dieffenbach, official editor of Unitarianism, preaches at times under the auspices of the Greater Boston Federation Sunday Evenings at Medford Hillside Radio Station. He speaks as follows of the radio utterances of Dr. Massee of Tremont Temple, Boston (C.R. 1923:1131):

"What awful stuff! And the great radio station of one of the stores in Boston is a broad-casting accomplice in this wretched business. Into thousands of homes the evil things about a fiendish, murderous God

plays with Unitarian and other ministers as actors whose setting Prof. Badé approves of as "keeping close to the historical situation as revealed by modern scholarship." And with its "citizenship honor roll" it can "help to get out the vote."[40]

The Unitarians have their own National Federation in which they are banded with Reform Jews, Universalists, Hicksite Quakers and whatever else is alien to evangelical Christianity. Strange that they should so strenuously seek to break into the Federal Council in whose constituency they are so unwelcome. But recognition by the Federal Council of Churches would pave the way for admission to the administration of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. and Unitarians have sought for this even more insistently.* In this way they secured entrance into the Interchurch Movement in Massachusetts.[41] I suppose that it also accounts for the fact that the Massachusetts S. S. Ass'n has voted to admit Unitarian schools under conditions[42] and that the report of the American Unitarian Association for 1918 congratulates its constituency on "the admission for the first time of a Unitarian delegate to the meeting of the International S. S. Association."[43]

The Young Men's Christian Association was first organized in Boston in 1851. Memories of the Unitarian defection were still fresh in the minds of the founders and their plan of organization was unquestionably determined thereby. In order to forestall diversion of their gifts they confined the administration of the institution they were establishing to men of the evangelical point of view, and provided in case this stipulation should be

are poured in the name of the religion of Christ. It is terrible. We should as lief hear a minister advise a maiden to yield her chastity, a youth to steal a purse, as to have people taught as they are taught by Dr. Massee."

The Massachusetts Federation shelters both Dr. Massee and his critic.

*Mrs. W. H. Robey, speaking for a modification of the Y. W. C. A. test at the 1924 convention put her finger on this point: "We face a situation anomalous, divisive, and to many seemingly unjust. The Y. W. C. A.'s are placed in the position of debarring as electors many who are taken into full fellowship by their local federation of churches." —*Y. W. C. A. report,* 1924, 73.

disregarded that Association property should go to the American Bible Society. An inactive mortgage of $600,000 on the Huntington Avenue property, I am told, passes to that society in case of the abandonment of the evangelical basis.*

Mr. Russell Sturgis was active in securing this precaution. Mr. James Stokes of New York, one of the most generous Association patrons, sought to protect his gifts "from insidious Unitarian views" by the creation of a trust to which his residuary estate was to go. The income was designated for Y. M. C. A. pensions, support of training schools [that at Springfield excepted] and the like, so long as the Association stood on its historic basis. The will closes,

"I desire that the work for which the fund is hereby created shall be consecrated and used to and for the furtherance of the Christian doctrine of the complete atonement for sin through the blood of Jesus Christ once offered and that secretaries and teachers may be selected who are sound in the faith, believing in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures and the deity of Christ."

Writing to Mr. Weidensall Mr. Stokes spoke of the "destruction with which work of this kind is threatened when it becomes successful, rich, and prosperous;" and to Jim Berwick, freight conductor and evangelist, "As I grow older I appreciate the great foundation on which our Association is built, namely belief in the essential truths of the Bible and in the scheme of salvation which means sin, salvation and a Saviour. Some smart young fellows and others have decided that the Bible is not quite what it ought to be and they spend more time in finding out what it is not than what it is. I do not believe they can injure the Bible by any of their foolish talk and action. But it has injured a great many young men and it has crept into our Associations in some places and into one or more of our

*So determined were these Boston Y. M. C. A. founders to keep out Unitarians from their directorate that they adopted the following by-law: "Any member of the board changing his denominational connection shall be deemed to have resigned and the vacancy so created shall be filled as hereafter provided."

schools.* I take ground that if there is no sin then there is no need of salvation or Saviour and what is the use of the Y. M. C. A. anyhow in that case. There lies the foundation of all our work and all my work. May God bless and keep you in it."[44]

The year after the founding of the Boston Association, Unitarians organized a club for men on similar lines under the name of the Young Men's Christian Union, membership in which was [and is] by article 2 of its constitution open to "all young men of good moral character *and claiming to believe in the truths of Christianity.*" The Union had the backing of Boston society. On its roster of life members are the names of Alexander Agassiz, C. F. Adams, Oakes Ames, Oliver Ames, the Crockers, Beebes, Dexters, Hunnewells, Thayers, Kidders, Minots,

*The Association College in Chicago is in close relation to the University of Chicago. Young secretaries take courses under Profs. Mathews, Soares, and Artman, and among the occasional lecturers one notes G. B. Smith, E. S. Ames, and Clarence Darrow, atheist and attorney for the University of Chicago degenerates, Loeb and Leopold. Arrangements have been made by which the University of Chicago correspondence-courses may be taken in the Y. M. C. A. colleges. These courses are in Old and New Testament, Systematic Theology, Comparative Religion, etc. Chicago University grants degrees jointly with the Y. M. C. A. College.—*Association College Bulletin,* 1923, 38.

The catalogues of these Y. M. C. A. colleges contain interesting announcements. The college at Springfield in order to prepare secretaries for "Americanization work" offers a course in modern European erotic literature with readings from Flaubert, Balzac, de Maupassant, A. France, Brieux, Schnitzler, Hamsum and Strindberg. (Catalogue 1922-23, 59.) The Southern Y. M. C. A. college gives a course on religious conversion, religious epidemics and the crowd mind, divine healing and mysticism. "The student will be referred to the writings of James, Starbuck, Pratt, Coe, and Stanley Hall." A course on the Social Teachings of Jesus "seeks to discover the social emphasis of Jesus which, with the new scientific and social knowledge, may help toward an understanding of the spirit and method of life as reinterpreting the new facts of religious and social needs of our own time."—Catalogue 1924-25, 46.

Of a course in genetic psychology announced at Springfield it is discreetly said: "The evolution of the human soul in its complex environment furnishes examples of a serious nature when accurately observed and understood." Religious instruction is here "based on a study of biology, psychology and sociology."

"Perhaps," wrote Mr. Stokes referring to these schools, "there is some need for men who are founders like you and me to lift up our voices and cry aloud; or perhaps you might be right in saying that we can only cry aloud to God Almighty for his salvation."

Peabodys, Shaws, Shattucks, Sears, Sturgises, Bowditches, Wigglesworths, Thorndikes, and Welds.

The Union has had an honorable and uneventful history. It trudges along on Boylston Street and has not ventured even into other New England cities. The Association belts the globe. In the United States alone it numbers 900,000 members and is easily the greatest men's organization on earth. What a lump for leavening!

The line taken is "injustice to Unitarians."* The great body of Roman Catholics, non-church members and Jews do not seem conscious of any injustice. Tens of thousands of them enjoy the privileges of membership and are satisfied with the consummate administration provided. From one quarter alone comes the outcry and that in all notes and tones—ridicule, bluster, and threat. "With quiescence and acquiescence on the part of so many Unitarians and Universalists," writes the Rev. Dr. Reccord [Unit.], "the change [in the constitution of the Y. M. C. A.] will not come soon. This policy is not only dictated by

*R. R. McBurney believed that the perpetuity of the Y. M. C. A. depended on the retention of evangelical control and Mr. Richard C. Morse also. "Early in the seventies there was a good deal of protest against this test," writes Mr. Morse. "In not a few cities attempt was made to organize and carry on the work without it. But experimentation by local associations invariably brought the Association back to the evangelical basis. *It was the Associations with this test that secured secretaries and buildings, in other words, the men and money necessary to carry on the work. The Associations attempted upon other tests failed in the direction of both men and money.*"—DOGGETT, *Life of R. R. McBurney*, 186.

So Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall thought that the prosperity of the Y. M. C. A. "is primarily owing to its strong and clear position on evangelical lines."—MCFARLAND, *Progress of Church Federation*, 240.

Mr. Justice Taft has a larger vision than the "leaveners." He describes the Y. M. C. A. as one of the greatest agencies for helping young men. "In those to whom it offers its encouraging facilities it makes no distinction of creed or religion. It is non-denominational except that by one of the rules of its original organization its directors must be members of an orthodox Protestant evangelical church. This has been made the basis for severe criticism of its narrowness. I cannot share this view. . . . When I think that in China mandarins who are Confucianists or nothing contribute generously to the Y. M. C. A. establishments because of the good it does in the large cities of the far Orient I don't think it is for a Unitarian to withhold his aid and encouragement merely because he is not eligible to its directing management."—*The Religious Convictions of an American Citizen.*

laymen who are as devoid of theological training as they are instinct with theological prejudice. When patients determine the policy of physicians and clients dictate the methods of lawyers then it will be time for laymen to sit in judgment upon churches and ministers alike and dictate the theology of the American people."*[45]

"If the officials of the Y. M. C. A. find that Unitarians are 'easy,' " scolds another, "and will make no protest against being pilloried as non-Christians and will still give money to support the organization which casts aspersion upon them, then those officials will make but little effort to remedy the injustice and bigotry. . . . But if boards and central boards see that offering to Unitarians the use of libraries, gymnasiums, etc., is not enough and that Unitarians stand resolutely and self-respectingly for equality of Christian character in full Y. M. C. A. fellowship, then they will have their better natures quickened and will make greater haste to extend full Christian fellowship to those whose money they so steadily and persistently seek."[46]

Another complainant speaks of *"voluntary* taxation without representation."† It would seem as if the best way to rectify this "voluntary" injustice would be to have done with "voluntary" giving to the Y. M. C. A. and therewith with the attendant clamor. But would this fit in with the Unitarian plan of campaign? This insistent attempt to break down the constitution of the Y. M. C. A. is accented by an occasional gift to the Association's great work for the education and help

*Mr. Reccord lets out another dreadful secret. "It may not be generally known that the officers of the National Association have not only dictated its policy for nearly fifty years in spite of the fact that the leading New England Associations and many outside New England are opposed to it but they are trying to reach out and control the teaching in the schools in which Association secretaries and physical directors receive their training." C.R. 1913:608.

†Rev. John Snyder: "When we in the exercise of the right of private judgment reach different theological conclusions you shut us out of full citizenship in that Kingdom of God which in our humble fashion we are helping you to create. Many of us are voluntarily taxed without representation." C.R. 1912:392.

There is a suggestion of persecution complex in these complaints against the Y. M. C. A. That this is a possible trait among Unitarians is suggested by an article by the Rev. J. T. Sunderland, who complained

of the general public. As a matter of fact I am told by the best informed Y. M. C. A. official in Massachusetts that Unitarian laymen regard the Y. M. C. A. membership test as a heaven-sent protection against solicitation of subscriptions.

One hundred and fifty millions have been invested in the Y. M. C. A. on the strength of its evangelical management. During the war Unitarians in the fire and fervor of the time contributed $75,000 for Y. M. C. A. war-work in France. A number of Unitarian ministers were sent abroad under the Red Triangle. The camel's nose was at last in the tent and the president of the American Unitarian Association now felt enough at home to pass judgment on the Association's religious life. The Y. M. C. A. hymn-book he told the public, was "a compilation of musical slang and literary trash. Chaplains and Y. M. C. A. secretaries, who have *some real religious sensibility* or a fair share of good taste, welcome our [Unitarian] hymn pamphlets." "Ministers who persuade the boys to come to Jesus and save their souls are religious demagogues" and their preaching "immoral nonsense."[47] [Eliot *fils* is indeed the spiritual son of Eliot *père.*] Dr. John W. Day complained of the shock which he felt when Christian clergymen at Camp Zachary Taylor actually prayed to Christ. It was "a kind of blasphemy."[48] I will not quote Dr. Dieffenbach on Y. M. C. A. religion. It is unquotable. It ends with *"I give this parting thrust to a fleeting shame* [Y. M. C. A. evangelical teach-

after visiting various evangelical churches that his ears were offended by mention of the Trinity. "Six different times the Trinity idea was thrust upon us. . . . Into the service were brought still other things not in harmony with the faith of Unitarians, as prayer to Christ as God, frequent use of such expressions as 'our Lord' applied to Jesus or 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' petitions for mercy or for salvation 'for Christ's sake.' This actually happened in a large Congregational church reputed to be particularly liberal! If a guest comes into our home we do not show our welcome by saying to him at once things which we know will grate on his feelings, things concerning which we know he holds radically different views from our own. But this is just what a Unitarian attending an orthodox church usually finds himself confronted with." Mr. Sunderland contrasts with this the breadth and courtesy of Unitarians. C.R. 1912:1117.

One can imagine from this what would befall evangelical religion if "liberals" had their way in the Y. M. C. A.

ing]. *It will soon be gone. We are coming into new days. The last days of evangelical test in the 'Y' are with us. . . . I have spoken to men who have made and are now making the Association's history. They know.*"[49]

That there are men in the Association who would betray the donors of the past is probably true. There were those in the Congregational churches who sold out the founders of Andover. President Doggett of the Y. M. C. A. College at Springfield talks of "the dead hand" and "dogmatic shackles" in the approved fashion of the Andover endowment raiders.[50] The student associations are the point of primary attack. In the University of Michigan the ruse used was to revive a defunct organization, "the Students' Christian Association," admit Unitarians and then merge the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. with it.* In the University of Wisconsin, Protestants, Catholics, Buddhists, and non-church members are admitted on the same basis.[51]

The Y. W. C. A. is also kept in a state of intermittent fever by the efforts to alter the basis of active membership. In reading the reports of the last three national conventions one is conscious of the real meaning of this agitation. Mrs. Dwight Morrow, for example, in supporting modification used this conclusive argument:

"Having been brought up to believe that Presbyterians get the highest seats in heaven I have been obliged to sit at the feet of some *Unitarians whose boots I am not worthy to black.*"

Miss Shanks made this statement: "I want to quote what was said in my presence a few months ago by one of our leaders. A person of prominence in one of our large institutions

*This would presumably leave the Association open to the influence of professors in the Unitarian church at Ann Arbor, Prof. H. F. Goodrich for example, President of the Western Unitarian Conference, who I judge referred to his own opinions in describing the modern layman as "one who has left the past entirely behind, who had no very clearly defined religion of life, who is none too sure of the existence of God" (C.R. 1922:1102); or of Prof. Roy B. Sellars, a quondam student at Hartford Theological Seminary, now atheist philosopher of the University of Michigan, *who speaks of Paul's god as a cad.—The Next Step in Religion,* 181.

in the Middle West, *a Unitarian, said to him, 'Ten years ago we set out to capture the large universities of the land and we have practically done it and now we are setting about to capture the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A.'"*

Mrs. Gladding: "The student test for voting and therefore controlling membership proposes a statement of good intention capable of several interpretations. When a girl says, 'It is my purpose, etc.,' it does not follow that she acknowledges Jesus Christ as her God and Saviour. Only last Sunday in New York *a well-known Unitarian clergyman arraigned the Inter-church Movement for not admitting Unitarians.* 'We too believe in and follow Christ,' he said, 'but we do not require belief in the deity of Jesus.' If *a Unitarian clergyman* believes and follows Jesus *why may not Unitarian girls* not conscientiously take the student declaration?"

Mrs. J. E. Marshall: "Can you imagine yourself sitting with a board of directors planning a distinctly Christian program *with those who deny Christ's divinity?* We dare not expect God's blessing. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.* If this is a Christian Association it must be fundamentally for Christ."

Mrs. H. C. Swearingen: "It will be impossible to put over this religious program [for girls] with people who differ from us or even if they are indifferent," adding, with a homely reference to the servant-girl whose Catholic presence suddenly checks Protestant conversation at the dining table: "Some such conditions I fear will prevail, especially in our board meetings. Our womanhood and our self-respect will not allow us to speak against those who are working with us. . . . The thing that I fear is that we are bringing amongst us discord or else apathy."

Finally one blunt delegate remarked: "I love to think of the church as being a home. We have windows and doors in our houses to let in God's eternal sunshine and ventilation but we have screens to keep out dust and flies. We must keep out things that don't help us."[52]

What is the motive back of this continual drive to get into the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Federal Council of Churches, and other organizations of American Christianity? The answer is fairly given by a Unitarian editor:

"Our doctrines are especially good for budding and grafting on older stock. If the name is sometime repellant the substance when transplanted and allowed to spread by inoculation has a wonderful power of expansion. We are sometimes astonished to see how our position on the virgin birth, miracles, etc., has been incorporated into the body of an old faith. To be sure *these new and vigorous branches are of a nature to render the remainder of the tree of but little value. . . .* We should frankly confess that our unadulterated doctrine, *the honest truth frankly uttered,* does not appeal to the masses but when a strong flavor of it appears in an old stock it is often welcomed with enthusiasm. Then it appears under the enticing name of liberalism.

"The Unitarian body is constantly grafting new thought, purpose, and method on the older churches. . . . *By indirection a large part of the finest and subtlest work is accomplished. . . . The purpose of its very existence is to widen the area of liberal thought by a movement without which the old churches might have fossilized. . . .* No great landslide from the old ranks as was once predicted has taken place, but it is one thing to tear down a structure with tremendous noise and dust and another to transform it vitally or to assist the spirit of the age in this great work."[53]

In this work of transforming Christian churches and institutions, Unitarians are depending on the co-operation of crypto-Unitarians in evangelical churches. *"A good many Unitarians,"* says Dr. J. W. Day, a leading Unitarian minister, *"are doing more good where they are than they could do anywhere else. They are undoubtedly capturing strongholds that we could never carry by direct attack. They are the modernists of Protestantism who are working from within the fold. . . . We want more of them and we want them where they are."*[54]

So effective is this co-operation in Unitarian eyes that the editor of the *Christian Register* feels justified in speaking of the fight against evangelical Christianity as already won though many do not realize it. "Every little while we read of some belated inhabitant of a remote locality who does not yet know how the Civil War turned out."[55]

These intriguers do not want a too speedy withdrawal of the neo-Unitarians from the Christian churches. They are not interested in unendowed theological wraiths like Dr. Crapsey.* Any such abandonment of present associations, *"not to speak of invested interests,"* writes Prof. F. G. Peabody, "would demand a sacrificial heroism *which might seem ill-advised or premature."* Far better is *"a gradual process of spiritualization* (!) penetrating the existing churches as spring comes in New England."[56]

The ultimate hope is of a landslide bringing into Unitarianism modernist ministers, churches, people, endowments, institutions. "A hundred years ago," said President Eliot in Ford Hall in 1920, "the Unitarian denomination took in rather suddenly a large number of ministers who had been up to that time connected with the Congregational church; but there was a phenomenon then which does not recur in our time. *We should be very glad to have it recur.* There was a large expansion of the Unitarian fellowship in those days because when a minister came over from another denomination he generally brought his church with him or at least the major part of it. . . . *We would like to have that experience repeated*

*"I am as badly off as a nameless man. I cannot do business in the religious world. Apparently I am nothing and belong nowhere. One who has not this isolation can have no notion of what it means."—Crapsey, *The Last of the Heretics,* 292.

Prof. F. G. Peabody congratulates him "on the privilege which is given to you through the bearing of others' burdens to fulfil the law of Christ." Another Harvard Unitarian, Col. Higginson, wrote in similar vein. Dr. Palmer, the editor of the *Harvard Theological Review,* wrote: "One may almost envy you the opportunity of pouring out blood (!) for that" [i. e., the hastening of the time when similar Unitarian views will be held in the church].

Crapsey writes, "Again I exhort my brethren of like belief to *stay where they are."* 280.

*in our generation. It would be an admirable mode of recruiting the Unitarian fellowship."**[57]

Base as all this seems there is no doubt that it is the present program of Unitarianism. Let me add more evidence.

"Liberals, unhatched Unitarians, are in all the churches," says the Rev. Minot Simons. "Some way must be found to bring them together and to organize them on the basis of liberalism. *To be suspected of Unitarianism would discredit them with their associates. . . . If we believe that we are the leaven then we must get busy on the whole lump. . . . Let us subordinate every other interest to this."*†[58]

"Oh, that I might see the leaven working more rapidly," sighs one correspondent in the *Christian Register*;[59] and on the next page a Unitarian "missionary" visiting "hide-bound Nashville" explains why his advertisements were headed "Truth, Worship, Service" [rather than a frank Unitarian announcement].

"To have led a direct assault upon those orthodox fortifications would have aroused unnecessary antagonism at the start and shut the doors of the city in our faces. I certainly should not have had three invitations to address the Y. M. C. A. at Vanderbilt University and a local Methodist church which

*For a century there have been next to no accessions to American Unitarianism. They are, therefore, watching the disturbances in the churches with the sharpest of appetites. The *Christian Register* (24: 282) has its eye on the Old First Presbyterian Church on Lower Fifth Avenue. Will it withdraw from Presbyterianism and become an independent church? "Such a step would without doubt make a great upheaval throughout Presbyterianism. There are literally hundreds of liberal Presbyterian ministers who with their congregations would need only some such heroic example as the historic First Church to cause them to follow the lead. What an exodus to liberalism there might be!" And among the Methodists too!

It adds that the legal provisions protecting the church property "might stop the whole movement." The glorious army of liberal martyrs! But cases *have been known* where legal stipulations have been successfully evaded by liberal theologians.

†Few people read Unitarian literature. If they should they would be struck with the constant reiteration of this figure of speech: "What could Unitarianism hope to achieve?" asks Dr. E. A. Horton, "To permeate other churches with liberal tendencies . . . to leaven the lump of modern Christianity." Dr. Putnam is then quoted as saying,

furnished the entering wedge." Then he adds: "Suggestion is admissible, letting the truth slip into the back door of the mind unawares when the front entrance has been barricaded."[60]

The Rev. Dr. Crothers of Cambridge uses another figure but the meaning is the same. It is a frank confession of proselytism. "Our task is very largely a task of transplanting the religion which has grown up on traditionalism, transplanting it into the new soil . . . prepared for it by true thinking."[61]

"The name 'Unitarian' I care little for in itself," says the Rev. F. A. Farley, "and while I see the thing which it denotes doing its work and leavening the mass I am content."[62]

Dr. Slaten of the West Side Unitarian Church, New York, explains the method. He had been a Baptist minister for twenty-one years but during the last ten of them accepted the Unitarian position [i. e. without avowing it]. During this period he was the Baptist pastor at the University of Michigan, professor in the Y. M. C. A. College in Chicago, and Bible instructor in William Jewell College. His Unitarianism became so obvious that the trustees of the latter institution requested his resignation. Whereat pandemonium in the press of the country. The Inquisition was again at work; Slaten a martyr in shirt of flame. What he says of his tactics is this: *"In some of the churches at least, the very principle of freedom on which the denomination is based guarantees him* [the crypto-Unitarian] *his right to remain. It is strategic to remain and work from the inside. Many others are doing it successfully and the gradual permeation of the orthodox denominations with*

"Unitarianism considered as a lump is very small but considered as a leaven it is vast and omnipresent. As an organism it is feeble; as an influence it is irresistible."

"I find in this fact," continues Horton, "that we are leaven and not the lump, nothing that should exalt or depress us. . . . I do not see why other churches should exhibit feeling if we claim this position and this work. They have other and more tangible trophies; we are virtually contributing to their greatness and power. By our sacrifices they are fed. In our poverty is their richness. We cut a path: they walk in it. We inaugurate a philanthropy; they enjoy it," etc.—*Unitarianism*, 7, 8.

liberal ideas disseminated by trusted leaders of their own appears to them the best procedure. Until recently this has been a procedure that was comparatively easy to follow. Now it is uncertain and dangerous."[63]

Then follow the reasons why, concluding with a greeting from the secure fold of Unitarianism, "Brother and comrade, come over."*

This is in the best style of Canisius and the Ingolstadt Jesuits and it is the recognized procedure of Unitarians, their historical *modus operandi.* "The formation of Unitarian societies in some of our towns and villages where there seemed to be an opening for them was discountenanced," writes the Unitarian historian of the early days in New England, "on the ground that it was better for 'liberal persons' to retain their connection with the orthodox societies with the expectation of gradually modifying the creed."[64]

In No. 223 of the official tracts of the American Unitarian Association, the Rev. W. S. Morgan describes his passage to Unitarianism. "A liberal brother from a neighboring town came to see me. He had said some radical things from his pulpit to which objections had been made. *Don't label your heresy, was my advice. Do as I do. Give them heresy in such a fashion that the very saints will not suspect it. Bad ethics, you say! I say, very bad! But this is the only way in which hundreds of orthodox pulpits can be held. When it was whis-*

*Prof. Slaten in a sermon in the West Side Unitarian church, N. Y., made this aside: "I understand a representative of William Jewell College is in the city today to raise $60,000. I hope he gets it. The conservatives cannot halt the march of progress and ultimately that money will pay those who teach the things now proscribed." C.R. 1923:458.

What this coming religion is for which we are subscribing money he defines as follows (*N. Y. Times,* Nov. 9, 1925): "Where the old religion made the supreme object God the new makes it humanity; where the old controlled conduct by the assumed favor or disfavor of the Deity the new makes the effect of one's conduct upon social well-being the controlling consideration; sociology takes place of theology and the world-hope of an improved social order replaces the belief in a blessed immortality. . . . The great question has been, 'Where will you spend eternity?' The great question now is, 'Where and how will you spend the rest of your life?"

pered abroad that in my ministry of three years I had not preached a sermon on the blood of Jesus cleansing us from all sin I saw clearly that I was discovered." Mr. Morgan was a Baptist minister educated at the Yale Divinity School.

In the same official tract the Rev. Thomas Clayton tells a similar story. When he became a Unitarian, he says, "*I was advised to stay where I was and keep some of my opinions to myself, gradually to sow the seeds of liberalism and wait until the time was ripe for more aggressive agitation.*" This it will be remembered is essentially the advice of Prof. Peabody's *Yale Review* article.

Alexandre Morel, in his studies of butterfly life, tells how he searched for cocoons of a magnificent and rare butterfly in the Haut Valais, hoping to raise some of the purple and silver beauties. He finally succeeded in finding five chrysalides in perfect health on a certain Alpine plant which attracts them. But when the time of birth came, out of the first crawled an ichneumon; out of the second another; out of the third still another. Only the fifth and last produced a butterfly.

What had happened? The ichneumon fly had deposited its egg in each of the living caterpillars. The ichneumonized caterpillar lived as if nothing had happened,—ate, grew, constructed its cocoon. The unfortunate caterpillar did not realize it was possessed, that under its skin it carried a perfidious enemy, which while letting it live, slowly destroyed it or rather transformed its destiny altogether. In fact this mysterious substance which should have given birth to a butterfly passed altogether into the body of the little larva and became an ichneumon.

Dr. Theodore T. Munger, a leader of Congregationalism in the last generation, wrote of Unitarianism, "I feel more than ever the terrible lack in that denomination. There is a great gulf between them and us."[65] But thirty years of "permeation" has brought a distinct change in the situation. A prominent Congregationalist with Unitarian sympathies, Dr. A. W. Vernon, said ten years ago, "I hope that I shall live to see the day when it shall be as hard to distinguish our two branches

of Congregationalism from each other as it is to tell twin daughters apart who have forgotten to tie up their braids with a blue and a red ribbon. I fear that our extremists will discover that in spite of their violent efforts to divide us there is one who is our Master and all we are brethren."[66]

The Old South church, Boston, now admits Unitarians to membership and dismisses its members to Unitarian churches.* Dr. G. A. Gordon appears at Theodore Parker centenaries and when his own anniversary comes around grateful Unitarians of the Laymen's League apply to him the salutation, "Thou art my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." The Congregational and Unitarian clubs hold on occasion joint dinners.† Both denominations have summer conferences on the Isle of Shoals‡ and Unitarians have had book counters at the Congregationalist bookstore. Dr. S. A. Eliot records Congregational and Unitarian churches "worshipping together" at Taunton, Uxbridge, Peabody, Berlin, and Pepperell. The Central Church, Boston [Congregational], summers with the First Church [Unitarian]; the Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, with neighboring Unitarian churches. "In Lowell they are making history these days," writes the *Christian Register*. "The High Street Congregational united with the local Unitarian church to form All Souls church." The fusion church directly at-

*Thus fulfilling the ideal of the Unitarian J. W. Chadwick—a gradual disappearance of orthodoxy in all denominations "until dividing lines shall offer as little obstruction to . . . going back and forth among them as the equator offers to the cruiser's gliding keel."—*Old and New Unitarian Belief*, 240.

†Forefathers' Day, Dec. 20, 1920, Dr. N. Boynton said to the gathered Unitarians and Congregationalists, "No nobler monument could be reared to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims than the closing of *the insignificant and principally past participle differences* between these common communions and the shaking of hands together and the recognizing before the whole great world of truth that these two fellowships, once together, are together again for the glory of God and the salvation of the world, saying to the world, Sirs, we are brethren." C.R. 1920:1266.

‡"Let the candle-light procession [a Unitarian function on the Isle of Shoals] lengthen until it unites the Unitarians and Congregationalists in one fellowship of light and be a sign and wonder to all other sects and denominations."—Dr. Rihbany, C.R. 1915:1211.

tached itself to the Unitarian Association of Middlesex County. Again it records with satisfaction, "For the first time in their history the Congregational and Unitarian conferences of Cape Cod met in joint session." The Middlesex Association of Congregational ministers has held a joint meeting with the Unitarian to consider closer relations. The ministers of the two denominations in Dedham in 1923 issued a statement declaring that what they "held in common was greater than the things we hold in difference. . . . We are not representatives of rival enterprises but comrades of a common quest."[67]

What these *rapprochements* mean is obvious enough. They represent no church union in the sense in which the Presbyterian churches in Scotland united in 1900. They are a flat surrender of the faith to anti-Christianity. Thus when a union of this sort was arranged in the country town of Francestown, N. H., the Unitarians sent thither as minister Dr. G. W. Cooke, an outright atheist.[68] When in 1917 the shortage of coal led to "union services" in some fifty-four places in New England the annual report of the Unitarian Association (1918) admonished its constituency to *"beware of any permanent union which is based on compromise. They must not sacrifice any of their hard-won simplicity of faith."*

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER IV

1. C.R. 1911:298. 2. Emerton, *Unitarian Thought*, 269, 254, 169, 165, 170, 190, 191, 172, 42, 119. 3. Chadwick's *Old and New Unitarian Belief*, 155, 212, 160, 214, 190. 4. Dole, *Catechism of Liberal Faith*, 39, 42, 44, 87, 82, 110. 5. *Liberal Christianity in the U. S.*, 12. 6. Eliot, *Religion of the Future*, 23. 7. *A Free and Open Christian Church*, 3. 8. J. M. Wilson, *From Authority to Freedom in Religion*, 7, 9. 9. Rainsford, *The Story of a Varied Life*, 458. 10. Rihbany, *Jesus and His Place in Christian Thought*, 12, 16, 18. 11. E. E. Hale, *The Unitarians*. 12. C.R. 1914:417. 13. Eliot, *Religion of the Future*, 12, 14. 14. Eliot, *Crying Need of a Renewed Christianity*, 14, 13, 12, 15. 15. Eliot, *Twentieth Century Christianity*, 3, 4. 16. Potter, *The New Unitarian Statement of Faith*, 11. 17. Casson, *Three Great Words of Modern Religion*, 19. 18. Savage, *The Signs of the Times*, 109. 19. C.R. 1920:945 and 1921:827. 20. C.R. 1921:751. 21. C.R. 1921:825. 22. C.R. 1921:1015 and 1924:438. 23. C.R. 1920:670. 24. C.R. 1920:506, 603. 25. C.R. 1921:899. 26. C.R. 1923:7. 27. C.R. 1919:876. 28. C.R. 1920:294. 29. C.R. 1913:582. 30. C.R. 1914:20. 31. C.R. 1913:307, 319. 32. C.R. 1916:657. 33. C.R. 1922:976. 34. C.R. 1921:1206. 35. Sanborn, *Life of S. G. Howe*, 336-40; H. B. Stowe's *Memoir*, 298. 36. C.R. 1922:170, 336, 332, 248. 37. C.R. 1919: 699. 38. C.R. 1921:104. 39. *Facts and Factors*, Jan., 1925. 40. *Federation*

Bulletin, Jan., 1924. 41. C.R. 1919:1220. 42. C.R. 1921:880. 43. *Report of Am. Unit. Assn.* 1918, 57. 44. James Stokes, 704, 228, 200. 45. C.R. 1913: 608. 46. C.R. 1916:891. 47. C.R. 1918:173; 1917:1156. 48. C.R. 1918:1138. 49. C.R. 1919:824 and 966. 50. C.R. 1922:1137-8. 51. C.R. 1920:117 and R.E. 8:73. 52. *Natl. Reports of Y. W. C. A.,* 1924:85; 1920:72 and 45; 1923:77-79; 1924:72. 53. C.R. 1910:339. 54. C.R. 1912:314. 55. C.R. 1915:76. 56. *Yale Review,* 1924:439. 57. C.R. 1917:126. 58. C.R. 1915:1018. 59. C.R. 1916:605. 60. C.R. 1916:606. 61. C.R. 1917:155. 62. C.R. 1915:661. 63. C.R. 1923: 548, 95, 317-18. 64. Ellis, *The Unitarian Controversy,* 44. 65. Bacon, *T. T. Munger,* 131. 66. C.R. 1914:1139. 67. C.R. 1919:459, 1910:641; 1917:403; 1915:751; 1911:1206; 1917:1204; 1925:716; 1918:646; 1923:640; 1921:595; 1914:427; 1922:184. 68. C.R. 1923:477 and 1920:506. 69. *Report of the Am. Unit. Assn.* 1920:55.

CHAPTER V

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

> They cackled (how they cackled!) crying everything was new;
> The old truths were all false, the new lies were true.
> —*Alfred Noyes.*

THE Religious Education Association was founded by President W. R. Harper and the theological school of his university has furnished to it its quota of leadership. There has been a slight smoke-screen of evangelical membership but this seems less noticeable than formerly. Radicals and rabbis [Dr. S. S. Wise, Dr. Judah Magnes] gather at its meetings and aid substantially in its finances. Thus the free-thinker, Paul Carus, publisher of *The Open Court,* was, when living, one of the larger subscribers to its funds, and Profs. Leuba, Stanley Hall, and Starbuck, all of whom are listed in McCabe's *Dictionary of Rationalists,* have read papers at its sessions. Prof. Starbuck, in an essay published by the American Unitarian Association [*Religious Education in the New World View*], presents what is palpably the Unitarian opinion regarding the organization:

"Salvation by education is coming to be the great watchword of this generation. . . . Any passing observer must be convinced that the Unitarian clergy generally are among the warmest friends of better religious education. . . . The Unitarian church has cordially entered upon this task as one of its greatest privileges. Here is the rarest opportunity opening up before the liberal churches. Happily we are accepting it."

So they are and the whole Unitarian phalanx is lined up in the Association. Prof. F. G. Peabody is a former president.

President Eliot was a speaker at its Chicago Convention, Dr. Dole at Cleveland, Drs. Rihbany and J. H. Holmes at Boston. Dr. S. A. Eliot is director at large and most of the other Unitarian leaders are members. "No association could come nearer the ideals of our own churches than this," says a writer in the *Christian Register* (Unit.): "It is an association devoted entirely to aims identical with our dearest loyalties. . . . *Unitarians can do no better work for their own cause . . . than to enter into cordial relation with the brave enterprise* so splendidly carried on by the Religious Education Association."[1] "It is doing our work to an extent that we little realize," writes the Unitarian Dr. Minot Simons. "It is one of the great liberalizing forces of the modern world." "A prophetic organization" rhapsodizes another Unitarian, "the most important religious movement of the age."[2]

The reports of the Association overflow with radical utterances. I quote in the note below from a paper of Prof. Leuba of Bryn Mawr.* Such extreme expressions of unbelief are not common. On the other hand one would have to hunt long through the twenty-three arid volumes of reports to find a

*"The assumption of a personal cause back of the physical universe has no scientific value. It is true that it silences the child's questionings for a while, perhaps for all time, but this is not good; it is an evil. . . . From the point of view of the understanding of physical phenomena the belief in God is not one of the steps through which a child needs pass for it would not help him to ascend to modern scientific ideas about nature.

"It might be maintained that this God has an ethical value for the child. . . . Can we not do better for the moral and religious welfare of our children than trust to the influence of a miracle worker who, being omnipotent, does good and evil or at least permits evil? Could not everyone of the religious feelings be more adequately stimulated by the relations of the child to his parents, to society, and to nature?

"It is a harmful perversion of a truth, obvious to the child, to teach him that 'God' gives him his food, his clothing, and his bed. And it is of advantage neither to his intelligence nor to his morals for him to be allowed to think at any time of his life that rain and sunshine, health and sickness, depend upon the will of an invisible, all-powerful being."—J. H. Leuba, *Children's Conception of God.* R.E. Vol. 12:13.

In R.E. Vol. 6:268, is a paper on Conversion and Moral Distinctions. Conversion is assimilated to savage rites on attaining puberty as at the initiation of Bechuana youth. Since conversion is more or less discredited a sort of civic ceremony should be instituted to take its place with civic oaths and festivals.

gracious and loyal word about Christ. I must confess that I have not come across one.

The Association definitely renounces fresh organization. Its plan is to advise and co-operate with existing ones. This means the conscious and systematic infiltration of the institutions of the church with the opinions which the Association really stands for even though it disavows allegiance to any particular school of thought. The channels for this canalization have been dug in every direction. Commissions and councils and committees of great variety have been set for the devising and execution of programs. The whole Sunday-school system of America is to be transformed.* "Fifteen years ago a group of men, chief among whom was President W. R. Harper, saw that the hope of success for the great reconstruction movement in religion and theology then imminent lay in the on-coming generation. The Sunday-school, which up to that time had received small attention from such men, assumed at once a new significance as furnishing the natural medium for inculcating new formulations of old truths. The results of the original and constructive thought of this man are seen in many of the newer organizations for religious efficiency" [Georgia Chamberlain, University of Chicago],[3] notably in the Religious Education Association which Profs. Sanders, Kent, and other Harperides have led since Dr. Harper's death. To this end the *Constructive Course of Bible Lessons* (28 vols.) has come from the University of Chicago and the *Graded Series of the Bible Study Union* (Scribners). *The Blakeslee Bible Study Union Lessons* are edited under similar auspices, Messrs. Kent, Coe, Sanders, and Horr being the Board of Consulting Editors.

*A Commission on Sunday School Associations was appointed in 1909 by the Religious Education Association. On it were Messrs. Coe, Cope, Sanders, Starbuck, Soares, Votaw, Mutch. I suppose a sentence of Prof. Starbuck's, when the commission was announced, would fairly express their point of view. "The present defect which stands in the way of real spirituality is the implicit assumption that the end of religious teaching is to put such and such an amount of Scriptural teaching into the minds of the recipient." R.E. 1909:426.

"Between 1908 and 1914," writes A. A. Brown (*History of Religious Education in Recent Times,* 183), "a battle royal was on in the Sunday-school world. . . . The outcome was the International Graded Lessons and the organization of the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations in 1910. This new organization was composed of the official representatives of the several denominational agencies for Sunday-school promotion, the editors and publishers being strongly predominant," was radical in sympathy and formed apparently because radical opinions were not able to get a foothold in the International Sunday School Association.* After much opposition it succeeded in effecting a merger with the older association under the title of the International Sunday School Council of Religious Education [disregarding the convention vote for the title *"of Christian Education"*] and Prof. Athearn, who stands in close touch with the Religious Education Association, was made chairman of the Committee on Education.

Later the name of the joint organization was quietly changed "in the interest of brevity and simplicity" into the International Council of Religious Education. We are told in the official year book of this Council (51)† that "the Religious Education Association has decided to maintain advisory relations *only with*

*This S.S. Council of Evangelical Denominations has worked amicably with the R.E.A. in the past. Prof. Kent speaking of certain college courses in Bible, said: "The proposed courses here outlined are presented in behalf of a joint committee representing the Association of College Instructors in the Bible, the Religious Education Association, the Student Y. M. C. A. *and the S.S. Council of Evangelical Denominations."* R.E. Vol. 8:457.

†This *International Year Book of Religious Education* advertises Van Loon's *Story of the Bible* thus:

"This wonderful book is of a type with the classic of John Foster, also the *Story of the Bible,* which has served generations of Sunday School pupils. While every part of the Bible is written about with great and thrilling beauty the part devoted to the life of Jesus will undoubtedly stand out as one of the greatest and most reverent biographies of Christ ever written. This noble enduring master-piece is truly called the Spiritual Story of Mankind."

The book is a "free-thought" paraphrastic summary of the Bible. Yet its advertisement appears in the official organ of the Sunday schools of America.

the [lesson] committee of the Council in view of the fact that it comprehends within its scope religions other than the Christian religion."*

*The Sunday school teachers are to be taken in hand. Dr. R. L. Kelly of the Council of the Church Boards of Education writes: "Now that the merger between the Int. S.S. Assn. and the S.S. Council of Evangelical Denominations has actually been achieved this demand [for trained teaching] will no doubt be accentuated and rationalized." C.E. Oct., 22:29. The R.E.A. has long been planning for this contingency. Prof. Kent has been chairman of the R.E.A. sub-committee on Sunday school teachers' training courses in colleges and universities. (R.E. Vol. 7:101.) The Teachers' Training Commission of the R.E.A. reports on training Sunday school teachers (83): "At least one-third of the first year's work should be given to the study of texts of the nature and scope of Gilbert's *Students' Life of Christ.*" R.E. Vol. 7, 83.

At the Garden City Conference of Agencies of Christian Education, 1921, at which Messrs. Cope, Sanders, Kent, and the others of the familiar company were present, "particular emphasis was laid upon the significance of the proposed consolidation of the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations and the International S.S. Association *and it was urged that the strength of the whole group of agencies in this conference should be put behind this movement.*" R.E. Vol. 16:288.

That the R.E.A. has from the first aimed at the Sunday schools of the nation is clear enough. President King of Oberlin writes: "It [the R.E.A.] could not wisely undertake the publishing of Sunday School courses because . . . it would surely cut it off from the much larger task of suggestion, of guidance, and of cooperation concerning all their varied agencies and interests." R.E. Vol. 2:10.

Messrs. H. H. Meyer and G. H. Betts are prominent among the Religious Education Sunday school theoreticians. In Mr. Betts' *How to Teach Religion* [dedicated to the two million teachers in our church schools] we are told (119): "If the story is properly told the child does not have to be taught that the Bible myth or legend is a myth or legend: he accepts it as such without troubling to analyze or explain." On 120, "But once a sufficient proportion of Bible stories is provided for, stories should be freely drawn from other fields. An abundance of rich material possessing true religious worth can be found in the myths, legends, folk-lore and heroic tales of many literatures."

Mr. Meyer's *The Graded Sunday School in Principle and Practise* [in Modern S.S. Manuals, edited by Kent and Winchester] makes the same suggestion, 78. "From the lowest to the highest grades the S.S. curriculum, while giving first place to Bible instruction, will also utilize much extra-biblical material. . . . Fairy tales, myths, folk-lore, and legends all have a place here," 75. . . . Mr. Meyers says of the Bible, "It is not a sorcerer's book, the separate verses and sentences of which are surcharged with mystical import and power."

Mr. Athearn's point of view can be perhaps gathered from his commendation of the Beacon Series [Unitarian] of the S.S. Lessons as "the best in the world, those of the University of Chicago being second." C.R. 1911:472. He would have the R.E. Association "join with the Int. S.S. Association in a crusade of agitation for the establishment

The Young Men's Christian Association has been the subject of Religious Education Association operations.* "The Religious Education Association," we are told with perfect assurance, "is steadily accomplishing precisely those purposes which were outlined for it at the first convention. In the Y. M. C. A. it [the R. E. A.] has led to the more general adoption of thorough, scholarly courses of Biblical study."[4] The Rev. R. C. Knox is even more specific. Speaking of college Y. M. C. A.'s and Y. W. C. A.'s he says: "Above all in their Bible study they should have the historical viewpoint. . . . Men like King, Kent, Jenks, Fowler, Bosworth, and others have woven into the instruction of Christian Associations the strong fibre of thorough and unbiased scholarship."[5] Prof. Artman, former dean of the Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago, now of the Religious Education department of the University of Chicago, describes the objective of the rationalizers. "As a movement within the Protestant church the Y. M. C. A. shared some of the weaknesses inherited by the Protestant from the Catholic church, such, for example, as the bondage of abstract theology, *the goal of individualistic salvation,* legalism, and the casuistry which always goes with it, all of which still bind and enthral the brotherhood sadly. Along with church leaders the leaders of the Association are gradually freeing themselves from these weaknesses and frankly adopting *the socialization of man as the Christian goal."*[6]

Chautauqua which with its "heathen" Methodists is, as we have seen, a foreign mission field of Boston Unitarianism, was in the days of Bishop Vincent a center of genuine religious instruction and help. Its department of religious work is now

in our colleges of departments of Religious Education." R.E. 1911:80. The [Unitarian] *Christian Register* calls Drs. Cope, Weigle and Athearn "the hope of the children of America." 1922:415.

**Report of the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A.,* 1924:40: "The Religious Work Department of the Y. M. C. A. also [is] to maintain relationship with the Religious Education Association and the National Association of Bible Instructors, 35, Boys Work. Important relationships are to be maintained with [among others] the Religious Education Association.

in charge of Dean Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago. A pastor at Chautauqua writes: "Dean Mathews is one of the ultra new theologians and a very talkative one at that. Result, complete drying up of the fervent spiritual zeal and evangelistic fervor of the old days. Old Chautauquans come back each year and seek by religious meetings to kindle the fire anew, but in vain."[7] A delegation from the University of Chicago has carried on religious education: Mathews, New Testament; Willett, Old Testament; and Miss Chamberlain, stories in religious teaching. Religious Education Association Weeks are held with Messrs. Coe, Votaw, Cope, I. F. Wood, Sanders, and Starbuck as speakers, the last a one-time psychologist of the American Unitarian Association [registered as we have seen in McCabe's *Dictionary of Rationalists*], discussing "Character Development Through the Sunday School."[8] Prof. Peabody, the Harvard Unitarian, has been a member of the Chautauqua faculty of religious education; also Prof. Hoben, a radical of Chicago University. Dr. H. Augustine Smith, director of the Department of Fine Arts in Religion of the Religious Education Association, has charge of Chautauqua music. He is the editor of the Century Company's *Hymns for the Living Age,** which attempts to tune our tongues to Unitarian psalmody, every eighth hymn in the book coming from that source. ["If a man were permitted to make the

*This hymnal and *The Hymnal for American Youth* which the Century Company also publishes fairly bubble with "leaven." One thinks of a packed caucus when one observes these strange faces in a supposedly evangelical hymnbook. John Haynes Holmes appears with four hymns, Hosmer with five, Samuel Longfellow with *fifteen* [more than any other contributor] and Longfellow's old co-worker in the compilation of Unitarian hymnbooks, Samuel Johnson, with four. Longfellow's biographer tells how the "two Sams" eliminated from their "Hymns of the Spirit" such numbers as "attributed a peculiar quality and special authority to Christianity and recognized a supernatural element in the personality of Jesus." Then we have a raft of mediocrities—Bulfinch, Tarrant, Chickering Williams, Wille, Clute, Freckleton, Blatchford, Burleigh, Page, Hopps, Russell and Wreford. Vague fustian abounds, "Marching with the heroes, comrades of the strong," "Life of ages richly poured," and the like. Everywhere the emphasis is on the *epigeia* rather than on the *epourania.* Christ is mentioned by name but once in these 67 Unitarian hymns and allusions to Him are to be found in but four or five others.

hymns of a church he need not care who should make its theology" *The Church of the Spirit,* F. G. Peabody (15)]. Mr. Smith stands for modernism in music. Hear him on "Fine Arts in the Curriculum":

"New subjects claim the attention of both church and state. Armistice Day, Church Federation Day, City Beautiful Week, World Peace and Brotherhood Education Day. New texts, new ritual, will work wonders in displacing deprecatory psalms, slashing sections out of canticles and chants, sluffing off vain repetitions and pagan wailings. . . . The fine art of community ritual is a direct protest against ecclesiastical worship. The latter has been built upon theological tenets, on the prophets and ecclesiastics of old, on tradition and smug prejudice."[9]

The Bible chairs in the colleges are dominated by men who are in close touch with the Religious Education Association. The National Council of Bible Instructors has in its organization a large part of the three hundred or more college Bible teachers.* Its president up to his recent death was Prof. C. F. Kent of Yale. As his voluminous writings are used by most of his colleagues it will be worth while to examine at least one of them. Prof. Kent speaks of the criticism he favors as "an exact science." The impression one rather gets from his *Life and Times of Jesus* is of the most uncritical romancing.

The resurrection evanesces into mere illusion. "Pursued by fear and anxiety Peter would easily reach the sea of Galilee *on the third day from Jerusalem. . . . With the eye of faith* he saw the Friend and Master."

What then became of Christ's body?

"Many hold that the body was removed some time between the close of the Jewish Sabbath and sunrise of the first day of the week at the command of Joseph who had offered the

*A New York conference of this organization at Columbia University, sixty Bible teachers in colleges and Y. M. C. A.'s being present, was opened by Dr. Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation with the words, "Science has rendered an enormous service to religion by stripping the life of Christ of the myths and legends and imagery by which it has been covered." R.E. Vol. 7:707.

tomb as a temporary resting-place. Naturally *Joseph would wish to reserve the tomb for the use of his own family.*

"In any case the problem of what became of it was of significance chiefly to those who shared the current Jewish belief in a bodily resurrection."

This is historical criticism! Kent tells us that "many modern New Testament scholars are inclined to interpret the resurrection stories as visions without objective reality." If Christ be not risen your faith is vain, was Paul's categorical affirmation. The Yale professor thinks differently.

"This view, far removed as it is from the current doctrines of the church, does not undermine the historical foundations of Christianity. The essential elements in the Gospel are what Jesus was and taught and these corner-stones stand quite independent of the resurrection stories."

Jesus' mighty works were not so mighty after all. Even the miracles of healing were not always permanent. . . . Matthew 12:43 suggests that certain of these acts of mental healing were only temporarily effective and that a recurrence of their maladies sometimes left the poor victim in a more pitiable state than before. The cure of leprosy was presumably merely the relief of "a curable skin disease." The daughter of Jairus was in fact not dead but sleeping and *Jesus assured Himself of this before He undertook to raise her up.* In general one gets the impression from this book that Christ's cures were mere autosuggestion. They are compared with those of the Holy Coat of Trèves.

Of course our Lord's power over the forces of nature cannot be allowed. "Jesus words, 'Peace, be still,' are even more appropriate if originally addressed to His perturbed disciples rather than to the troubled sea. The feeding of the multitudes is to be thought of as a spiritual feeding."

The whole Scripture is trimmed to the materialistic dogma of the impossibility of the miraculous. There can be no such thing as prediction. "The Christian apocalypse in Matthew 24 *must have been written* about a decade after the destruction

of Jerusalem for it reveals an intimate familiarity with that event." This assumption makes of Prof. Kent a late-dater in spite of the fact that "modern criticism" in the person of Harnack assigns Luke to the sixties and the other Synoptics earlier.

Incident after incident in gospel history is set aside as untrue. Our Lord could not have walked on water. "An account of how Jesus in the blackness of the night waded out to meet His disciples has been unintentionally clothed with a miraculous splendor." "The statement of the Fourth Gospel that Jesus was arrested by a cohort of soldiers numbering many hundreds and that they first fell to the ground at the sight of Him has all the characteristics of later tradition." The Transfiguration, it is suggested, is a lost account of Jesus' resurrection appearance to Peter. So is the New Testament turned topsy-turvy as by *Poltergeister*. As the incidents of the Passion are assimilated to the stories of Cæsar's death [Virgil in his *Georgics* states that, "at the death of Cæsar there was an eclipse from the fourth to the ninth hour"], so the miraculous in His ministry is compared with Gautama's incarnation, temptation, and feeding of multitudes. Here is apparently nothing more than mythopoeic fancy.

Our Lord's "conception of Fatherhood" we are told strongly suggests that Joseph was wise, just, and considerate. . . . Unlike many oriental fathers he apparently took his children and especially his eldest son Jesus into his confidence and thus established that relation of paternal comradeship which is present in Jesus' teachings." So from *this* source comes our Lord's lofty teaching concerning the Father. He is not the eternal Son of the eternal Father but earthly son of a just man and good parent. Nor did He owe His divine wisdom to the Father. In Nazareth, Jesus had ample opportunity to study intimately the varied phases of human life so that in time it was unnecessary that any should tell Him "for he knew what was in the heart of man." The account of His boyhood visit to the temple discloses one "who for the lack of a better term we

are wont to call a genius . . . but from another point of view Jesus was simply a normal boy."

And the deepest meaning which Prof. Kent can find in Christ's life and death is that of teacher. He was the saviour because He was the teacher of man. . . . Having learned the value of service He taught men how to find their life by losing it in behalf of their fellow-men. . . . Jesus' death was the supreme demonstration that the one unfailing way in which sinners may be saved is the way of love and complete self-sacrifice [i. e., of their own love and self-sacrifice]. This is, according to Prof. Kent, the meaning of Jesus' death. As to Jesus' saying, "For the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, . . . and to give his life a ransom for many," he makes this a mere comment of Mark under Pauline inspiration, in no way representing Christ's point of view. So jauntily does he juggle documents in the name of historical criticism.[10]

Of this criticism he observes elsewhere, "Those who catch this spirit become *infected with an enthusiasm almost Pentecostal.* It is destructive only of superstition which in former times obscured the real spiritual greatness of the Biblical writers."[11]

"A new day has opened for the presentation of the Christian religion," says the Unitarian reviewer of this book, "a day in which many men hitherto divided will clasp hands and work together in spiritual ardor."[12]

The Bible chairs in American colleges were established by men and women with an earnest interest in the development of Christian faith and character. Never in the world would they have countenanced such frivolous and perverted teaching as we have just quoted. But it is just such teaching that is dominant.

That great pioneer of women's education, Mary Lyon, when connected with Derry Academy made so much of Bible teaching that the trustees objected. So she went with her green velvet collecting bag among the farmers of Western Massachusetts until she had secured enough to found an institution [Mt. Holyoke] which should be "perpetually Christian." The out-

put of useful women which followed through the century has had no parallel. They were trained by her in the Scriptures and in Butler's *Analogy* and were followed to distant lands by her prayers, the tenderness of which was a tradition of the school.

Prof. Laura H. Wild, who now teaches the Bible at Mt. Holyoke, has little of the old spirit in spite of her past as a Congregational preacher. Her views are "dynamic, not static." President Wooley introduces her to the public as "a re-interpreter of evangelical Christianity for the young men and women of the student classes who cannot be held by an outworn phraseology."

This lady tells her young women at South Hadley that the Apostles' Creed is but "a kind of shibboleth, a necessary password to the orthodox but totally without meaning in as far as real living is concerned. College students do not care to waste their time examining into such an historic document when life is so full of interesting questions which they cannot begin to compass in four short years."

It takes a modern broom, indeed, to make such a clean sweep of the past.

"Shall we," she asks, "be followers of the interpretations of modern scholars or of interpretations evolved in the less enlightened days of church history?" The question answers itself.

"Christian democracy is the keynote of the modern interpretation of Jesus' teachings." It's "a much more worth-while effort than to exert oneself to get into the body of the elect." The sin against the Holy Ghost is "refusal to co-operate with the vital principle of betterment." Those who "substitute whole-hearted service of the Socialist cause" for such "ecclesiastical rites as the Holy Communion" compel our admiration. "Sad to say," however, "some good church members are not ready to shift their emphasis from the Nicene creed to the brotherhood of man." "It's no wonder that the majority of young people are puzzled." "The evangelical terminology

seems to have been stranded in a lagoon; the currents of life are passing it very swiftly."

"Jesus the Great Teacher is the divine messenger of this good news of brotherhood . . . the one great and apparently *only* saving idea for the progress of humanity." "The most effective appeal of the present day seems to be far different from the appeals of the past that have 'converted' many souls."

Professor Wild has also written of "The Evolution of the Hebrew People." One would say a Buckle *redivi.* "Born in the tropics, as we believe, from *the find of the first man in Java,* man would always have remained an infant in that steaming, enervated climate had he not wandered." Old Testament religion can certainly be accounted for on natural grounds.

"The monotonous surroundings [of the Semites] coupled with some of the most marvelous effects of sky and landscape due to the dryness of the atmosphere, account undoubtedly for much of their religious fervor, at the same time narrowing them down to a few great ideas." God had little to do with Israel's history, at least directly. "There were three factors that entered into their [the Hebrews] development, the land, their outside enemies and their native genius. Some would add a fourth, the help of God, but God's providence manifests itself through the first three in shaping destiny. Therefore in beginning the study of Bible history our first consideration must be the land."

The great word, "in the beginning God," goes into the discard together with the Apostles' Creed.

After this we can look for anything. The story of the Passover's institution is legend. The Abraham, Joseph, and David cycles of stories, fictitious. The first is compared with the Greek myth of Iphigenia; the second with Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves. "Paul's writings," we are told, "are not especially in vogue today. We are more or less out of touch with his mode of expression." "The church has been affected too

much by Pauline theology. It is easier to understand the Sermon on the Mount than the doctrine of Justification by Faith." We are advised to compare Galatians with other "essays" such as Emerson *On Self-reliance* and Dr. Cabot's *What Men Live By.*[13]

The first book recommended for collateral reading in Biblical History 1B at Mt. Holyoke College is the *Outline of History* by the free-thinker and king of sciolists, Mr. H. G. Wells. Badé, Fowler, Cornill and the rest follow.

Who could believe that from training of this sort women would be developed such as those who founded the Huguenot college at Wellington, South Africa, the daughter college of Mary Lyon's Mt. Holyoke?

Yet in 1923-24, Prof. Wild was sent to Ginling College, Nanking, a union college for girls operated jointly by Presbyterians, Baptists, and Disciples to spend a sabbatical year teaching young Chinese girls. This was one of the women's colleges which benefited by the three million fund for the higher education of women on mission fields raised the preceding year among American Christians.

Henry F. Durant, the founder of Wellesley College, was a man of the world, Harvard-trained, leading pleader at the Suffolk bar. He was converted to Christ and became a lay preacher. A visit with D. L. Moody to Mt. Holyoke interested him in women's education. He presented that college with a library building and in 1871 laid the corner-stone of the new college at Wellesley. In that corner-stone he placed a Bible in which was written,

"This building is humbly dedicated to our Heavenly Father with the hope and prayer that He may always be first in everything in this institution; that His Word may be faithfully taught here and that He will use it as a means of leading precious souls to the Lord Jesus Christ. Except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build."

Mr. Durant refused to have his name given to the college or to permit a portrait of himself in the buildings. "The

college belongs to God not to me," he would say, and in his family was wont to pray, "O Lord, bless *Thy* college."*[14]

Miss Helen M. Gould founded a professorship in biblical history in Wellesley College. It is now filled by Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, who is prominent in the Religious Education Association. Prof. Kendrick appeared at the 1917 convention of the R. E. A. with a pupil who read a paper on the effect of the two years required Bible study at Wellesley. It describes an unenlightened girl coming to college "into a community where independence of thought is developed."

"She enters a class in biblical history. One by one she sees them go—the facts which to her were the very foundation of her religious life. She can no longer believe in the creation of the world as told in the Old Testament or in the story of Moses and the burning bush. As she goes on into the study of the New Testament higher criticism lays bare to her the fact that the story of Jesus' birth is not authenticated, that the feeding of the five thousand and Christ's walking on the sea cannot be taken literally and that possibly even her belief in the Resurrection is groundless. In fact all the mysterious and supernatural gifts of Jesus which had formed the core of her spiritual life now seem either based on unhistorical facts or disapproved by the workings of natural laws. . . . Her loss of faith in everything divine first stuns her but leaves her at last, as she styles herself, 'a regretful agnostic.'"

The testimony of other students is given. One who had expressed her hope that the college would "leave her the divinity of Christ untouched" has become reconciled to her loss. "I have learned to judge Jesus by what I found him to

*"Mr. Durant preached today. If only you could have heard him, all of you. It seems as if some great strange thing had happened and we must speak and walk softly as when some one has died. There was an atmosphere of sacredness about it all. It is enough to break one's heart to see his grand white head among these hundreds of girls and hear him plead with them for 'noble, white, unselfish womanhood,' to hear him tell of his hope and happiness in them and his longing that the blood of Jesus Christ should cleanse them from all sin. That was his text. I never heard and never shall hear anything quite like it for clear logic and tender appeal."—*Alice Freeman Palmer,* 110.

be, not by some vague ideas handed down to me." It should not be forgotten that all Wellesley students are *required* to pass through this Unitarianizing mill; also that there is no corrective in outside Bible study. "Because of this study [in the class-room] the Christian Association has a definite background on which to base its voluntary Bible study classes. The aim of these voluntary classes can be to work out the principles already attained in required biblical history study into a code for every day life."[15] Wellesley College conducts a Community School of Religious Education for training its students to popularize what they have learned. It may be added that Prof. Kendrick spent her sabbatical year in mission institutions in the Far East in 1923, as Prof. Wild in 1924.

Prof. Kent, a dozen years ago, when reporting as chairman of the R. E. A. sub-committee on Sunday school teachers' training courses in colleges, said that "in equipment and variety of courses the women's colleges are far in advance of other institutions."[16] And a kindred spirit, Prof. I. F. Wood of Smith, gives weighty reasons why "women's colleges ought to give special attention to religious education . . . because the religion of the future is more in the hands of women than of men. . . . In the main the women's colleges have responded to the demand. . . . Most of them present the Bible in the light of modern conceptions."[17]

Sophia Smith left in her will $375,000 to found an "evangelically Christian" college for women at Northampton, Mass. The third article of her will read, "Sensible of what the Christian religion has done for myself and believing that all education should be for the glory of God and the good of man, I direct that the Holy Scriptures be daily and systematically read and studied in said college and that all the discipline shall be pervaded by the spirit of evangelical Christian religion." In order the more carefully to fulfil the wishes of the founder, a Unitarian woman preacher, Rev. Margaret B. Crook, has been made associate professor in biblical literature at Smith College. Miss Crook comes from the Octagon Chapel, Nor-

wich, England, associated with the Martineaus, and employs her leisure time in doing "missionary work" in the Middle West, lecturing on "The Challenge of Fundamentalism for Liberal Christianity," etc. Prof. I. F. Wood, the head of the Bible department, is a "modern" of the conventional type.

In his inaugural address at Bryn Mawr, President Rhoads, speaking of the founder of the college, Dr. Joseph Wright Taylor, said:

"As in the case of almost all of our institutions of learning Bryn Mawr was founded in motives of Christian benevolence. Dr. Taylor desired that it should ever maintain and teach an evangelical and primitive Christianity as set forth in the New Testament and the trustees will endeavor to carry out this trust in the spirit in which it was imposed." A letter from an English Friend, Mr. J. Bevan Braithwaite, was also read at these exercises. "We well know," it ran, "that Dr. Taylor had especially at heart in its establishment an education hallowed and ennobled by the wisdom, the truth, and the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. . . . It was his prayer that Bryn Mawr should become in the highest and most blessed sense a school of Christ in which the students should learn of Him under the training and gracious discipline of his Holy Spirit the lessons of His truth and love. It was his joy to devote his property to the noble purpose of preparing Christian woman to take her just place of influence in the sin-stricken and self-seeking world. . . . He would have the college ever prove the presidency of the divine Master in a continual illustration of the word which seemed like the keynote of his humble and devoted life. 'God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.'"[18]

That consummate scholar and saint, Dr. Rendel Harris, was the ideal Bible teacher for Bryn Mawr. He was succeeded by Prof. G. A. Barton. In running through Barton's *Jesus of Nazareth* [in the Great Leaders (!) Series] one recalls the early German rationalists whom Strauss so unmercifully manhandled.

The leprosy which Jesus healed was presumably a curable skin-disease. "In the moonlight [at Gethsemane] the perspiration *looked like* drops of blood." On Galilee our Lord rebuked the storm, saying "Peace, be still." "One cannot help wondering whether the words were not addressed to the complaining disciples, but the wind, as so often happens there, subsided as quickly as it had risen. . . . The disciples thought that the blowing had ceased in obedience to their master's command." "The contortions and cries of the mad man" was that which scared the Gadarene swine into the sea. Jesus' prediction of a resurrection in three days was simply a prophecy of a final resurrection, for the words "after three days" may mean "in the future."

The story of the Transfiguration "expresses in oriental imagery the impressions made on uncritical minds." "The modern observer" would not have been so easily duped. "The rainy season was not over and a dark cloud floated by. Perhaps it thundered. . . . Now the thunder, if thunder it was, seemed to the disciples to proclaim and confirm the fact that Jesus was the Messiah, God's own chosen Son." The fish from whose mouth the coin was taken by Jesus was really sold and the proceeds paid the tax for Peter and his Lord. The miraculous embroidery came in later time. The roots of the Communion run into the fetishistic past. "Early men in many parts of the world have thought that by eating the flesh of gods or heroes they gained something of the spirit and power of the beings whose flesh they consumed. Jesus in instituting the Communion chose a symbolism which had been employed from the times of the cave-dwelling men."[19]

And much more of the same sort.

It is hard to see how this old-fashioned rationalism can come under the heading of that "evangelical Christianity" which the founder intended should characterize the life of Bryn Mawr. When we come to Prof. Leuba we have an unpardonable case of violation of a testator's wishes. Leuba is an atheist who glories in the prevalence of atheism in American college

faculties. The conclusion from his questionnaire [in "The Belief in God and Immortality"] is "that disbelief in a personal God and in personal immortality is directly proportional to abilities making for success in the sciences." Most of these atheists, he tells us, "are teachers in schools of higher learning. There is no class of men who on the whole rival them for the influence exerted upon the educated public and upon the young men from whom are to come most of the leaders of the next generation." That their influence is breaking down Christian faith of students is registered by Prof. Leuba as a matter of course.

"The student statistics show that young people enter college possessed of the beliefs still accepted in the average home of the land and that as their mental powers mature and their horizon widens, a large percentage of them abandon the cardinal Christian beliefs. It seems probable that on leaving college from 40% to 45% of the students with whom we are concerned deny or doubt the fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion.

"The difference between these young people, the flower of the land," continues this professor of psychology in what was founded to be a Christian college, "who turn to God when they need him, and the Zulus who think of the spirits of their forefathers only when they go to war, is that the savages never disbelieve in the existence of these forefathers whereas in their calm moments college men and woman do deny the God on whom they call in time of their need."*[20]

*A death that ends all Leuba thinks "a satisfactory, even a desirable goal.". . . "Many of the most distinguished moralists condemn the belief [in immortality] as ethically wrong," 313. Yet "much is made of it among benighted Christian populations," 313.

Prof. Leuba has the fanatic spirit of Soviet atheism. He would tear down all that reminds of God. The Thanksgiving Proclamations should be discontinued. "From an expression of genuine belief this custom has become an objectionable tradition which, the sooner it is abandoned, the better for those who keep it up and for those to whom it is addressed. It were better instead that we should be taught to realize our dependence upon each other and the gratitude we owe to the millions who strive, often in material distress, in order to build our material and spiritual prosperity."—*Belief in God and Immortality,* 324.

President Garfield of Williams tells of "an attempt made during

In Matthew Vassar's address at the first meeting of the board of trustees of Vassar College he insisted that "the training of our students should *never* be intrusted to the skeptical or the irreligious."[21] Prof. Durant Drake is a member of the council of the Religious Education Association. The American Unitarian Association publishes his tract, *What Religious Education Might Be.*

"The so-called religious education of today," he tells us, "consists chiefly of bits of the history [or pseudo-history] and literature of the Jews. . . . I raise the question whether the Old Testament legends and chronicles or even the gospel incidents and the missionary journeys of Paul are the directest and most vital means of awakening or reinforcing the religious life of youth. To try to awaken interest in the religion of today through a study of the Psalms and sermons and anecdotes of the Jews of two thousand years ago is a curious pedagogical inversion." He deprecates spending time in "the exegesis of old Jewish legends and of the hasty letters which an early Christian missionary wrote to his infant churches instead of grappling by day and by night to understand the extremely complex problems of today." The account of the life and character of Jesus given by most Christian churches is described as "naïvely unhistorical. This embroidery of miracles, this acceptance at their face value of the biased and naïve chronicles of the Jewish and Christian writers, is one of the baneful aspects of modern Bible teaching."

the year to place before students through the morning chapel readings some conception of the development of the idea of God . . . from the conception of Jehovah as a tribal deity, jealous and revengeful, to a righteous and merciful God of all nations." C.E. Nov. '24:29. To Prof. J. B. Pratt who is the successor of that great Christian educator, Mark Hopkins, in the chair of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy at Williams we owe the following sentences: "The Bible has lost all hold on the leaders of thought and certainly is destined before many years to become one of the curiosities of the past. . . . The inspiration of those who spake a 'Thus saith the Lord' is of only a little higher type than that of the whirling dervishes and heathen medicine men."

Mr. H. S. Dulaney, a trustee of Goucher College, in resigning, wrote "I am led by my own investigations to the conclusion that the Bible teaching in the classes of Goucher college . . . calls into question and casts doubt upon the inspiration, credibility, and integrity of the Bible." —H. P. Sloan, *The New Infidelity*, 37.

Prof. H. T. Fowler has the chair of Biblical History and Literature in Brown University. His *Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion* is a University of Chicago publication in Religious Education. The Jehovah of the Old Testament is in his opinion a tribal deity, a god with a small "g" (171) in contrast to the universal God whom Israel discovered in polytheistic Babylon. The religious evolution was from "a nomad god recognized by a small confederation of tribes" to one with "the more complex functions of the deity of an agricultural nation," his "sphere of influence" having been "transferred to the land of Canaan." "But it required the experience of exile, the widened view of the world below and the starry heavens above, such as came after years of life amid the culture of ancient Babylon, to bring to conscious expression the definite doctrine of God as the creator of all things." And Israel owed as much to the idolaters of Canaan as to those of Babylon even if the "the starry heavens" above Palestine had no lesson for them. "There was a genuine enrichment of the Mosaic religion from the elements absorbed [from Cannaanite religious practices]. It was impossible for the mass of the people even to come to know the great and awful Deity of Sinai's thunderclouds . . . except by the road they traveled of first mingling with his worship, that of the agricultural Canaanites.

"Much of the Canaanite ritual was preserved in purified form in the religion of Israel and its ceremonies became a mighty force. They played a great part in preserving through darkest days faith in a God not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." Ahab and Jezebel then might be conceived of as supporters of Israel's faith as the Marcus Aurelius on the Brown University campus that of the Christians of Lyons and Vienne.[22]

Prof. Fowler has been chairman of a committee of the Religious Education Association, one purpose of which seems to be to devise the best means of breaking to high school boys the fact of the impossibility of miracles.[23]

Amherst was founded with a profound Christian and missionary purpose. The motive of the founders in the dedication of their gifts is said to be "commiseration for our destitute brethren" and "obedience to the command of our divine Saviour to preach the Gospel to every creature." The first building was dedicated to Christ and his Church, an allusion, no doubt, to the college it was to succeed in the Christian leadership of New England. A Bible chair at Amherst has been filled in late years by one who was at the center of the movement culminating in the betrayal of Andover to Harvard and who declares that the time has now come for the reunion of Congregationalism with Unitarianism.

Prof. Peritz teaches the Bible in Syracuse University and is prominent in the councils of the R. E. A. His *Old Testament History* is a favorite textbook in college Bible courses. It is dedicated to his teacher, Prof. Toy of the Harvard Divinity School. Prof. Peritz thinks that "the uncritical use of the Bible in taking everything just as it stands has led in a large measure to a distortion of God's way in dealing with man." He will not be guilty of this mistake. He tells us that "later generations of Hebrews, conscious of what Moses had done for them as a nation, delighted to weave about him strange happenings much as we do about Washington." So, for example, we are to think [after the manner of Dr. Paulus] of Jehovah "in connection with a volcanic mountain whose symbols were the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, terrible to behold or approach."[24]

Dr. W. J. Mutch of Ripon College [Congregational] active in the R. E. A., tells us that "the religion of the Williams College of the days of the historic haystack prayer-meeting or of the Mt. Holyoke of Mary Lyon's time" has become extinct. It was a type that was "consciously Christian without much analysis of the factors of its character."[25] Dr. Mutch does not grieve over this change. Another R. E. A. leader, Prof. Votaw of the University of Chicago, looks for the time when the hold of Christian contributors on the institutions they

founded shall be altogether a thing of the past. In *Religious Education,* 1910, 299, he says, "The American college began as an institution of religion. This status is passing. Some denominational colleges have discontinued their ecclesiastical connections and others will do so in the future on the same principle that the public schools are free from church control. Our educational institutions have the right to self-determination when they have achieved their majority. This will on the whole prove best for all progressive interests."

These notes will perhaps suffice to show how generally the Bible departments in church colleges have been perverted from the evangelical wishes of their founders. The great state universities though owing much to Christian ministers [those of Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan, and California were founded by such] and bearing the marks of Christian influence [the seal of the University of Kansas being a burning bush and that of the University of Indiana an open Bible] cannot in the nature of the case undertake Christian instruction. The churches, therefore, have established outside their walls foundations, university pastorates, and even Bible schools for the religious instruction of their studying youth. Now it is important that the quarter of a million young people in the ninety higher state institutions of America also receive a coat of modernist paint. This is especially so in view of the benighted beliefs of the households whence they come.

"A large proportion of the students in tax-supported universities," wrote Prof. C. F. Kent in 1923, *"come from homes where the instruction in religion has been of the sectarian and fundamentalist type. . . . It is not strange, therefore, that thousands of these students when they realize how impossible is the seventeenth century faith taught them in their childhood, make the fatal mistake of discarding all religion."*[26]

Obviously this must be remedied. A National Council of Schools of Religion has been organized of which Prof. Kent was, as of so many of these enterprises, the leader. On its committee appear most of the ultra-moderns, Fosdick, Jenks,

Merrill, Willett, Mathews, Badé, Soares, Barton, Wild, Merrifield, Athearn, Faunce, Sanders, Hocking, Wood, Cadbury. President Eliot is an active member of the General Advisory Committee of the Council. The Unitarians have for years subsidized Unitarian churches at university centers. The time is come to fill them with young people from Christian homes. I know of course that the scheme is "non-sectarian" in the old sense, Jews and Catholics being among its incorporators, but it represents its own special sectarianism. We have, indeed, nothing else here than a modernist drive at the state universities.

In 1921 Kent was despatched to the West to reconnoitre. His friends described him as "the circuit-rider" of the new evangelism. His mission was guided by the Council of the Church Boards of Education and was thus given a quasi-official endorsement of the chief churches of the country.[27] This did not prevent his giving great offense to the western obscurantists, as for example when he told them that "one might as well speak of the wool of the Lamb as of the blood of the Lamb."

In 1924 the first formal move was attempted. The University of Michigan was chosen as initial field of operation. A strong committee of Detroit capitalists was organized [with society patronesses and dinners at the Statler which would certainly have amazed an old-time circuit rider like Asbury with a salary of $80 per annum]. A drive for $1,200,000 was instituted. Prof. Kent explained in his promotional literature that the moment had arrived when "if the religious needs of our present civilization can be properly presented, the youth of America can be depended on to respond to the call to become apostles of the faith first proclaimed by the prophets and supplemented today by the findings of our great poets, clergymen, scientists, and men of action. . . . A creed formulated when everyone believed that the earth was flat and that the sun revolved about the earth does not satisfy this normal craving. Hence the wide-spread revolt of youth against mediaeval theology and its unnatural vernacular."

What they really crave, he went on to say, is a faith which embodies "the highest visions of truth and reality vouchsafed to the noblest prophets of the race whether it be Confucius, or Buddha, or Plato, or Isaiah, or Jesus."[28]

At the date of writing the Michigan School of Religion is, in the words of Prof. Kent's co-worker [Dr. O. D. Foster, university secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education], in an "ethereal and embryonic" stage "born in a manger but still struggling with its swaddling clothes."[29] Dr. Foster has explained the status desired for these schools. They "should be independent and yet affiliated with the university, perhaps through an interlocking directorate. The dean should be the full equal of the deans of the university."[30] "It is not impossible," wrote Prof. Kent, "that many of these schools of religion will in time be made regular departments of the state colleges or universities. Already plans are being considered at two or three centers to make the school of religion from the first a regular department of the state university."[31] Later systematic investigations of the legal situation "have made it clear" we are told "that in most states religious instruction can be offered in the curriculum itself. The report published as Bulletin V of the Council has shown that a majority of the institutional and legal provisions supposed to make religious instruction impossible are directed against sectarianism but not against religion itself."[32]

In other words, to a state university where no religious tests can be established a school of religion is to be attached, to all intents and purposes a great established institution of religion.*

*"Theoretically these institutions are not supposed to teach religion and in the main they do not, but gradually courses, religious and semi-religious, are beginning to permeate their curriculum."—*Bulletin of the Nat. Council on Religion and Higher Education,* IV, 3.

It may be asked why objection is not raised against the present representation of the churches at the University as a violation of the American tradition of the separation of church and state. The answer is obvious. Their status is wholly private and they have been placed there not to conduct propaganda but to shepherd the membership of the churches they represent. On the other hand Professor Kent distinctly stated the purpose of these Schools of Religion to be propaganda: *"The main*

It is to be directed by a group of men representing certain definite religious opinions, or as many would think, anti-religious opinions;* it is directed as Prof. Kent has intimated in so many words, against the evangelical faith and for propaganda among those who hold such a faith. Any other religious organization could hardly be established in competition with it in view of its priority and prestige and financial endowment. It would monopolize the ground and this is no doubt intended. Its promoters hope to bring into it wherever possible all the existing church foundations at state universities.[33]

According to the *Michigan Alumnus,* Dec. 20, '23, "a working arrangement with the Michigan Agricultural College is also planned to carry the religious influence of the school to remote communities of the state by development of workers for their social welfare in a religious non-sectarian [read Unitarian-modernist] way." Apparently instructors in religious education for the day schools of Michigan are also to be trained in these schools of religion. "The last annual conference of the R. E. A. was devoted to week-day religious education and proved to be

objective in a modern state school of religion is to expose" [as to an infection!] "*the undergraduates in the state universities to courses in religion that will meet the vital needs of which the majority are now only dimly conscious.*" C.E. April, 1923:354.

In *Christian Education* (1924:192) we are told that in the Department of Religious Education at the University of Oklahoma "the instructors enjoy all the rights and privileges of the regular members of the faculty. The chief difference between them and the other members of the faculty lies in the fact that the churches nominate the professors and provide their salaries, which pass through the treasury of the University. The scheme gives dignity and standing which could not well come in an affiliated or independent school."

It would seem about time to call for injunctions!

*The Commission of the Religious Education Association to investigate the preparation of religious leaders in universities and colleges issued a report (R.E. Vol. 7:338) signed by Drs. Fosdick, Starbuck, Doggett and others. This quotes the president of one of our most dignified universities "who prefers not to have his name quoted." "The time is, I believe, at hand when all intelligent Protestant bodies must accept the new and higher criticism which makes the Bible glow with a new light. *They must also accept the psychology of religion which begins with nature worship . . . and works up to the worship of humanity. . . . This sort of thing my own experience with students convinces me they want more than anything else* and cramming with dogmas and ecclesiastical attitudes repels the natural mind."

a time of great enthusiasm for the cause. The question of providing for the college training of instructors in this field was faced frankly and intelligently."

The inimitable Dr. Foster tells us in speaking of these schools of religion that "the New Jerusalem has not gotten out of the clouds though glimpses of it are being had here and there."[34] These glimpses reveal Rockefeller money set apart for developing leaders for the schools. Twenty-four holders of fellowships are in training chiefly at the Harvard, Union, and University of Chicago divinity schools. The administrators of this fund are H. E. Fosdick, C. F. Kent and H. W. Rogers. At the University of Michigan itself $300,000 endowment has already been secured and a special fund of $25,000 yearly for three years subscribed to launch the project. The first two lecturers under its auspices are Prof. Lake, a thorough-paced sceptic from the Harvard Theological School, and Prof. Case of the University of Chicago, who would run him a close second. The courses count for degrees as any other in the university. The names on the commission to select libraries for these schools reveal the thoroughly partisan character of the movement.[35]

The Council of the Church Boards of Education has taken the lead in organizing Schools of Religion as well as an Association of Schools of Religion.* The Council is supported by subsidies from the denominational educational boards.† "It brings into co-operative relation," wrote Prof. Kent (Scribners, March, '23), "the educational resources of twenty leading Protestant denominations [and is] a potent constructive force

*"The guidance of the growth of the schools of religion has been for many years one of the greatest challenges of our Council. . . . We are being looked to more and more as the central bureau for Protestant schools of religious instruction. Patience and perseverance will see wonders done here during the next decade." C.E., Jan. 1925:144.

†The Baptist educational secretary, Dr. Padelford, recommends a foundation to finance this Council. He sees "tremendous possibilities" in the Kentian Schools of Religion at state universities. C.E., 1923:336. Wiser is the judgment of an unnamed college president on the Bible teaching in colleges, "I believe that much teaching is today not only a failure to do what needs to be done *but is an assault on the essentials of Christian faith.*" C.E., 1922:146.

through the educational institutions for training the church leaders of the future." The public knows little of it. "Its work has been steady and quiet," says Mr. Micou, its president, "without much publicity." Prof. Kent has been co-editor of its organ, *Christian Education*. Dr. R. L. Kelly, the secretary of the Council, is active in the Religious Education Association and has lately served on its committee of five to formulate constitutional modifications. Other important positions held by him are membership in the Administrative Committee of the Federal Council of Churches and chairmanship of the sub-committee on student work of the Y. M. C. A. and of the Y. W. C. A. Commission on the Approach to the Churches. These relationships give him the confidence of wealthy Christians. "More and more information and recommendations are sought," he writes, "by foundations and philanthropists who wish to confer financial benefits to institutions. During the year the Council has responded to requests for information of this sort concerning no less than fifty colleges and seminaries and we have been assured that many of these institutions have been listed for financial benefits either in the form of gifts or inclusion in wills."[36]

This Council serves as a *liaison*, more or less definite, between the Religious Education Association and the evangelical churches.* It is working out with the R. E. A. courses in religious education for "colleges upon religious foundations." The R. E. A. has further drawn up a memorial on Bible as a college entrance credit to be presented to college and university authorities jointly by the R. E. A. and the Council of the Church Boards of Education. The Council has also set "a

*Dr. Cavert, Sec'y of the Federal Council of Churches, writes in *The Teaching Work of the Church*, 224: "In any educational council of the Protestant churches the Religious Education Association ought to have representation at least as an advisory body so that its facilities for research and for wider discussion may be more fully utilized by the churches. If some way could be found for bringing the offices of the Religious Education Association and the central offices of the needed educational council of the churches into close physical proximity . . . it would be a most advantageous arrangement."

commission to define a unit for secondary schools." Prof. Wild of Mt. Holyoke and Prof. Willett of the University of Chicago [with the late Prof. Kent] are on this commission and Dr. Kelly is its chairman.

That the Religious Education Association with its Jews and Unitarians, its Leubas and Starbucks,* should actually be engaged in drawing up a religious-educational scheme for the Christian institutions of the country is perhaps the last word in effrontery. Yet this is the case and its department of universities and colleges of which the free-thinker Prof. Starbuck has been executive secretary has a committee for the standardization of college and university biblical departments which has been at work seven years and has classified about three hundred of the colleges. And the official representative of the evangelical churches [the Council of the Church Boards of Education] is co-operating. "More and more," says President Micou, "it is appearing that our chief task is to unify all the religious educational forces at work in normal schools, universities, professional schools, and theological seminaries." "The serious attempt to standardize such departments has begun," writes Dr. Kelly. This is naturally awakening protest. "The complaint," he continues, "is sometimes made that the modern teacher of the Bible 'upsets' his students; that his teaching tends to unsettle the faith of their childhood. . . . Prof. Wood of Smith answers that the happier conception of religion which it is the business of the biblical departments to develop is far more frequent among students than it was a few years ago."[37]

"Out of these centres [the universities] will come a new interpretation of life and religion," says Dr. Foster, Secretary of the

*Prof. Starbuck in his *Psychology of Religion* takes the super out of the supernatural in Christian experience. "The facts of conversion are manifestations of natural processes," 143. "The religious experience known in theological terms as sanctification lends itself readily to psychological analysis," 375. "The central thing underlying all these phenomena [conversion] *seems to be the birth of the reproductive life,*" 147. Conversion is compared to overcoming dislike to onions or bananas. Diagrams are given on page 84 representing the "feelings at the time of conversion,"—circles with segments of circles and lettering, imposing constructions.

Council. "The church teachings cannot be cast into the mould of antiquated ecclesiastical dogma and command respect. They must undergo the most thorough-going criticism and be brought before the bar of reason to answer for themselves. . . . The university provides with its scientific method. . . comparative freedom from religious bias. Adequately equipped union schools of religion at the great universities should be in a most favorable position to give to the world what it has never really enjoyed—a scientific theology. . . . *All these needs cannot be met without great sums of money.* It is a most solemn fact that unless the church expects to bid adieu to a large percentage of her most promising young people she must meet this challenge." *Christian Education* (1921), the Kent-Kelly-Foster organ, counts up with delight the gigantic sums in process of extraction from the Christian public for allegedly Christian education. *It totals two hundred and forty millions of which seventeen millions are for theological seminaries.** "To succeed," continues Dr. Foster, "the proposed schools of religion must have a recognized agency to foster them [presumably the Council of which he is the secretary] . . . assurance of donors . . . and security from unnecessary sectarian attacks."[38]

There is the scheme in a nutshell. The money for these enterprises at the universities and elsewhere which the Religious Education Association and the Council of the Church Boards of Education are so interested in, is to be given by the churches and those who give it are to be forbidden to criticize the wildly rationalistic religion which is to be injected into the studying youth of the churches.

Dr. Foster is also related to the recently established interdenominational university pastorates. "No chart or charter for anything of this kind existed," we are told. "Without any code

*These people are materialists to the fingertips. "We used to hear it said," remarks a prominent leader in the Religious Education Association, "that the best thermometer of the church's spirituality is the prayer-meeting. We do not hear this saying any longer." The test suggested to take its place is the amount of money devoted to religious education by the church.

except personal confidence and a fraternal spirit, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Disciple official moneys have been pooled in a common purse and the state agricultural schools of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan, Colorado, New Mexico, California, Montana, and Idaho have been provided with pastorates."[39] Secretary W. F. Sheldon of the Methodist Board thinks that pastors to fill these positions should be chosen by representatives of the educational boards and of local interests *under the guidance of the University Committee of the Council of the Church Boards of Education* of which the very *aufgeklaert* Dr. Foster is secretary.[40]

During the past twenty years conference centers for college young people have been established at Silver Bay, Estes Park, Asilomar, Geneva, Blue Ridge, and Seabec to strengthen the Christian life with Bible study. The Council of the Church Boards of Education has apparently been given a certain leadership in these conferences. The deans of the men's conferences receive their appointment at the hand of the Council. Of the women's conferences Dr. Foster says, "If the way opens for me to get into one or more of these conferences in a vital way I shall take advantage of the opportunity after which we may be in a position to recommend something more definite another year. In time we shall arrive at more satisfactory relationships."[41] In one year 2,163 students have attended these conferences, 604 coming from foreign countries.*

The literature which has been poured into the market by religious educationists is ordinarily marked by an uninspiring dullness. In reading it one is too often reminded of Artemus Ward's old jibe about selling "Punch" by the pound. One wonders, for example, of many of these publications of the

*The Council of Church Boards of Education has drawn up 24 recommendations for the conduct of these conferences. No. 19 urges "that serious attention be given to the presentation of Christian fundamentals in a manner *consistent with modern scholarship and learning.*" No. 22 "that the two representatives appointed by the Council of Church Boards of Education be members of the committee which builds the program of the conference. *One of these should be as far as practicable*

University of Chicago if they would ever see the light of day save for the kindly offices of a non-commercial press. The Religious Education Association and its related organizations are active in commending to a reluctant market the literature of its members.

A commission has prepared two lists of "the most important books in the field of religion," one of 500 volumes for smaller universities, colleges and Y. M. C. A.'s; the other of 1,500 for schools of religion and larger colleges.* For secondary schools we are told that the library should have at least fifteen of the following, Buck's *Life of Jesus* (Unitarian), Peak's *New Century Bible,* Soares' *Heroes of Israel* and the works of Sanders, Mathews, Willett, Gilbert, and Kent. A report on Standardization of Biblical Departments in Colleges by Profs. Kent, Sanders and Wild issues a list of 250 books authorized (!) by the Association of Bible Teachers in Colleges.[42] It is standardized along the same line of authorship. A graded course in the life of Jesus commends for children from twelve to fourteen—*Lives of Jesus* by Gates and Forbush; for those between fourteen and eighteen, *Lives* by Burgess and

the university secretary of the Council," i. e., Dr. O. D. Foster! A similar series of recommendations is to be worked out in the Y. W. C. A. C.E. 1921:8, 9.

*President Micou says of the Council of Church Boards of Education: "We have now a group of three women students who can act as *liaison* officers in dealing with the national boards of the Y. W. C. A. as our various university secretaries have been for some years dealing with the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A." C.E. '22:9.

Northfield has caught the infection and the Northfield School of Sunday school Methods has changed its name to the Northfield School of Religious Education with a modernist, Dr. N. E. Richardson, in charge. The Unitarian religious education leader, Dr. W. I. Lawrence, in commenting on this "transfer of emphasis" says, "The theme for its next session is Religious Education and Reconstruction and its aim is to present the great call of the reconstruction task. Here is religion attempting to function *not in more religion* but in better society." R.E. Vol. 14:190 and C.R. 1919:492.

The churches too are to serve as outlets for this literature. "Every church may reasonably be expected to provide the necessary tools for its workers in religious education and hence to maintain a library of the most useful books on the subject [Kent, Wild, Coe, Betts, Peabody are named]. The school should hold at least one membership in the Religious Education Association ($4 yearly)." R.E., Vol. 15:53.

Bosworth; over eighteen the writings of Burton, Mathews, Jenks, and Kent's *Life and Teachings of Jesus*.[43]

A Declaration of Principles of Religious Education prepared by Messrs. Sanders, Kent, Votaw, Coe, Soares, and others "presses on the conscience of the church that missionary societies, theological seminaries, and training schools for missionaries unite to provide expert leaders in religious education for mission service and that schools for the training of lay workers in religious education be established in all parts of the country."[44]

Dr. Sanders, an old-time Wellhausen popularizer, is secretary of the Board of Missionary Preparation, which is supported jointly by the chief foreign mission boards and has its function, apparently, to provide a sort of finishing course to those who are starting to the foreign field. In 1924 a Joint Advisory Committee on Methods and Materials for Religious Education on the Foreign Field was established with Prof. Luther Weigle as chairman. [Prof. Weigle, with Prof. Starbuck, is mentioned in the 1917 report of the American Unitarian Association as preparing a series of textbooks for Unitarian Sunday schools.] This committee is to provide a single centre from which to make available to Sunday school associations, curriculum committees, lesson writers, and other workers in religious education in foreign lands, the experience gained in the development of religious education in the United States.

To attempt to follow all the plans for training Religious Education leaders and teachers would carry us far afield. A new profession we are told has been brought into being. Directors of Religious Education are being appointed by the churches to have full charge of Sunday school and Christian Endeavor.

"These are not assistant pastors but expert advisors and executive heads of the department of Religious Education." Groups of churches are invited to unite in hiring one of these new officials in case they cannot finance him alone.

Then there are to be directors of week-day and vacation schools of religion, field directors of religious education for Christian Associations, educational superintendents for denominational boards, professors of religious education in church colleges, directors of community schools for religious education, educational and evangelistic leaders in foreign mission fields—a whole hierarchy of office holders and supernumeraries to "eat the church," to use the Chinese expression. One thinks of the multitudinous "workers" of the mediaeval church—brown friars, black friars, white friars, gray friars. Follow a procession of Americanization workers, settlement workers, directors of forums, story tellers, women trained in the fundamentals of social engineering, workers to transform the rural school and church into centers of community welfare. "During the past two decades there has developed a well-defined body of knowledge regarding the development of religion in children and adults and of pedagogical methods of teaching religion [I am quoting from the *Bulletin of the School of Religious Education in Boston University,* 47].* A very definite technique is being formulated—scales, score-cards, and standards of measurement for measuring the processes of religious growth. Already literally thousands of persons are employed as experts in the application of this specialized knowledge to the spiritual needs of human beings. Almost without our knowledge a new profession equipped with all the elements necessary for professional service

*Prof. F. L. Strickland gives courses in the Foreign Mission department of the Boston University School of Religion. In his book, *"The Foundations of Christian Belief,"* he says (196): "It is not very long since the opinion prevailed among intelligent Christian people that the non-Christian religions are altogether false and unworthy of any consideration. The religions of the world were confidently divided into two classes,—the true religions, which included Judaism and Christianity and the false religions, which included all others. But this dubious and provincial way of thinking about God's relation to the greater part of the human race began to undergo transformation when the great non-Christian religions became better known." Prof. Strickland has no old wives' notions about prayer. He says on 234: "Religious books written by pious people . . . filled with a lot of anecdotes of miraculous answers to prayer [may be] of some interest and cause us to wonder as we read them, but they are not convincing." This is a textbook used in the school.

has sprung Minerva-like into existence. The new profession is here. The question is shall the graduate schools of the land standardize this new profession and make its practice safe and trustworthy?"

All these "workers" are being duly tinctured with Kent and Sanders and Shailer Mathews, as a glance at the reserved shelves of the Boston University School of Religious Education shows. And they are going to carry their modified and modernized Gospel to the uttermost ends of the earth. "The period of world reconstruction is calling for foreign missionary leadership such as no previous age has witnessed. The newly democratized nations of the world are demanding Christian teachers, preachers, and social workers more rapidly than they can be adequately trained. Methodist boards are asking for six hundred new missionaries each year. . . . If the church is to build up a system of religious education which will spiritualize the ideals of democratic world-society there must be raised up a vast army of religious teachers, administrators, and editors.

Nor is this all. "It is the profound conviction of this school that the church must again become the mother of artists and the generous patron of their works. As a contribution toward the preparation of leadership in this important field an unusual group of outstanding artists has been assembled as a permanent faculty for a distinct department of fine arts in religion." An American Pageant Association has been founded in Boston. "Workers" in this department are offered a course in the evolution of the drama, expounding its laws as formulated by Lope de Vega, Racine, Lessing, Goethe, Brunetière, Shaw, and Archer. A course in the technique of pageant accompanies it with instruction in the making of hats and properties and simple background together with the writing of plays and pageants, adapted to church or social "work." The bulletin tells us that "students must not allow their evangelistic fervor to wane while they are acquiring vocational technique." They are to keep themselves "God-intoxicated!" as if that would be possible to the most

experienced mystic in such an atmosphere of spiritual dispersion.*[45]

Nor are pre-college maidens to be forgotten. A committee of the National Association of Bible Instructors in American Colleges is studying with the Headmistresses Association the problems of biblical and religious education at the girls' preparatory and finishing schools. A modernist heads the education committee of the Boy Scouts. Reading courses for ministers have been laid out; city Bible institutes [as in Providence and New Haven] instituted with Profs. Kent, Sanders, Bacon, Moore, Tyson and others lecturing. The religious week-day teaching in public schools is to be pre-empted and one thinks of religious educationalists waiting on its emergence as cutworms on garden greens.†

Yet they are not indeed waiting idly. The state normal schools have not been neglected. In *Religious Education* (Vol. 11: p. 110) is a paper by Prof. G. A. Coe, entitled "A General View of the Movement for Correlating Religious Education with Public Instruction." From it one learns that the State Normal School of Greeley, Colorado, has been inveigled into giving credit for the study of Kent's *Historical Bible* and other modernist literature. "Here evidently the methods and the products of scholarly study are frankly assumed." Consequently

*President Micou of the Council of Church Boards of Education says: "The church is being won rapidly to dramatics and pageantry." C.E., '22:179. Again in speaking of the university pastors, after explaining that they have to meet the opposition of the local pastors to their "high-grade religious education" he says: "The fact that the local committee does not permit student pastors to have dancing makes the cleavage very great." C.E., 1922:7.

†What is in store for the children in the public school comes out in some sentences of Prof. J. M. Artman of the Department of Religious Education in the University of Chicago which appear in Cope's *Week-day Religious Education*. "The methods of Jesus, of Paul, of Moses, of Mahomet (!) are to be studied with open minds. *All those using the Bible as the text either as literature or for purposes of dogmatic doctrinal teaching miss entirely the scientific method.* The only foundation for a course in religious education is life itself." 103-4. "It would seem wise to utilize all the great Bibles, all literatures, all histories, the arts and sciences, because science certainly has given us great help in living," 110.

"the Sunday-schools" where the normal-trained teachers will perhaps teach on their rest day will be stimulated to take up in earnest their own proper task of producing understanding, appreciation, and character." Prof. Coe disapproves of the North Dakota plan, "which aims, directly at least, at nothing but a certain degree of intelligence concerning the Bible" (115) whereas "the controlling conception in Colorado is the religious needs of the high school pupils." "How many Sunday-schools will use this [North Dakota] non-historical syllabus . . . as an opportunity to keep alive anti-critical interpretations of the Bible and merely traditional conceptions of piety," 114. The sectarian purposes of Religion Educationists in public institutions are clearly enough indicated in these words.

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER V

1. C.R. 1912:282. 2. C.R. 1913:306. 3. R.E. Vol. 8:61. 4. R.E. Vol. 3:74. 5. R.E. Vol. 4:582. 6. R.E. 1919:322. 7. *Bible Champion,* 1923:402. 8. R.E. 1909 iv June. 9. C.E. 1923:403. 10. Kent, *Life and Times of Jesus,* 309, 299, 104, 105, 236, 107, 30, 271, 222, 282, 236, 290, 49, 50, 54, 315, 297, 247, 11. R.E. 8:455. 12. C.R. 1915:740. 13. Wild, *A Present-Day Definition of Christianity,* 42, 11, 12, 34, 37, 39, 40, 55, 53, 37. *The Evolution of the Hebrew People,* 46, 178, 131. *A Literary Guide to the Bible,* 8. 14. Charlotte H. Conant, *Address in Memory of H. F. Durant.* 15. R.E. Vol. 12:325, 329. 16. R.E. Vol. 7:106. 17. R.E. Vol. 11:483. 18. *Inauguration of Bryn Mawr College,* 17. 19. Barton, *Jesus of Nazareth,* 358, 210, 212, 304, 292-4, 298, 354. 20. Leuba, *Belief in God and Immortality,* 279, 277, 280, 205. 21. *Vassar* by J. M. Taylor, 26. 22. Fowler, *Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion,* 171, 471, 132, 44, 45. 23. R.E. Vol. 11:68. 24. Peritz, *Old Testament History,* 15, 67, 88. 25. *Journal of Religion,* May, 1923. 26. C.E. 1923:351. 27. C.E. 1922:8, 17; 1923:350; 1922:17, 8; 1924:178. *Bulletin of Natl. Council of Schools of Religion* I:5. 28. *Bulletin Natl. Council of Schools of Religion* II: 12, 13. 29. C.E. 1922:202. 30. C.E. 1922:202. 31. *Bulletin of Natl. Council of Schools of Religion* II:9. 32. 1924 *Yearbook of Natl. Council of Schools of Religion in Higher Education,* 3. 33. C.E. 1924:178. 34. C.E. 1922:202. 35. *Yearbook of N. C. R. H. E.* 1924:8, 14. 36. C.E. 1923:233. 37. C.E. 1922:4, 22, 25. 38. C.E. 1921:63, 66, 67, 23, 25. 39. C.E. 1923:254. 40. C.E. 1923:262-3. 41. C.E. 1923:243-4. 42. R.E. 12:146. 43. R.E. Vol. 8:513. 44. R.E. Vol. 7:119. 45. *The School of Religious Education,* Boston Univ., July, 1923, 47, 12, 11, 20, 88, 10.

CHAPTER VI

THE LOOTING OF ANDOVER

He was a Unitarian and meant to assist in the teaching of his own faith and not another. And we know of no school either of theology or of jurisprudence in which these two systems of faith were ever considered essentially the same. From the early days of Christianity they have always been deemed, as they have been in our day, antagonistic systems.—Princeton vs. Adams.

Where money was left to support "Christ's Holy Gospel" the court held that no Unitarian could partake of her bounty.—Attorney-General vs. Shore.

THE march of theological liberalism is ordinarily accompanied by more or less pillaging. The looting of Andover will always be a classic example. Dr. H. M. Dexter, the historian of New England Congregationalism, said of the breach of trust in the case of the five professors, "It outsizes anything else of the sort in the annals of a by no means unspotted century,"[1] and certainly the scandal has not grown less as the years have passed. Andover Seminary at the start was founded because of violation of trust.* The Hollis professorship at Harvard trained the Congregational ministers of New England before the Unitarians seized it. It was a foundation of Thomas Hollis, an English Calvinist Baptist, who stipulated that the man chosen to fill the chair should be of "sound and orthodox principles." In 1747 additional funds

*"Old foundations established by the Pilgrim Fathers for the perpetuation and teaching of their views in theology were seized upon and appropriated to the support of opposing views. A fund given for preaching an annual lecture on the Trinity was employed for preaching an annual attack upon it and the Hollis Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge was employed for the furnishing of a class of ministers whose sole distinctive idea was declared warfare with the ideas and intentions of the donor."—Mrs. H. B. Stowe in *Autobiography of Lyman Beecher,* Vol. 2, 110.

were given, also with the stipulation that the person occupying it should "profess and teach the principles of the Christian religion according to the well-known confession of faith drawn up by the synod of the churches of New England."[2] This was of course never done after the Unitarian Henry Ware was (in 1805) seated in the professorship.

The Phillipses in establishing the famous academies at Andover and Exeter made, as far back as 1778, certain provisions for the theological education of their graduates at the Andover Academy. It was natural, then, that the evangelical Congregationalists ousted from Harvard, should turn to this embryo theological department, the more so as the legislature having Unitarian sympathies was not, in their opinion, likely to favor the granting of a charter to an orthodox theological seminary.[3] [The opposition made to a charter for Amherst and the bitter propaganda centering at Harvard against that "priest factory" make this understandable.][4] Samuel Abbott, a wealthy retired merchant of Boston, revoked a bequest of $20,000 to Harvard because of its defection from Puritanism and turned the money over to Andover.[5] In his will he insisted that every person elected to be professor should make a solemn declaration of his faith in the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and "if at any future time, which may God forbid, the trustees of said academy should become so regardless of these my regulations and of my true object in them as to choose or continue in office a professor whose principles in divinity shall not be sound and orthodox in the sense aforesaid or shall not make, subscribe, and repeat the declaration herein just required . . . as often as such deplorable event may occur my will is, that the salary shall be forfeited to the use of the South parish in Andover. . . ."[6]

A group of business men in Newburyport and Salem, John Norris, William Bartlett and Moses Brown, associated themselves with the undertaking. Norris' special interest was foreign missions. He took ten thousand silver dollars from the bank, put them in firkins and devoutly consecrated them to God for

a seminary in which missionaries should be trained.[7] These "Associate Founders" remembering how the Hollis Foundation had been perverted, determined to safeguard their own property from a similar fate and to that end drew up the famous "Associates' Creed" with an almost incredible degree of caution to prevent the institution or any professor deriving his salary from the Associate Foundation from teaching opinions regarded as unsound.[8] Every professor was obliged to subscribe publicly every five years to this declaration of his faith and purpose as a teacher. Prof. Park did this for forty-five years, not merely as to substance but as to detail.[9]

Article 2 of the Associate Statutes provided that "every professor on the Associate Foundation shall be . . . an ordained minister of the Congregational or Presbyterian denomination . . . *an orthodox and consistent Calvinist.* . . . He shall on the day of his inauguration publicly make and subscribe a solemn declaration of his faith in divine revelation and in the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel as expressed in the following creed."[10] Of this I quote only eight clauses:

Article 2. I believe that the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only perfect rule of faith and practice.

Article 4. That in the Godhead are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.

Article 12. That the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God who for this purpose became man and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever.

Article 13. That Christ as our Redeemer executeth the office of a Prophet, Priest, and King.

Article 14. That agreeably to the covenant of redemption the Son of God and He alone by His suffering and death has made atonement for the sins of all men.

Article 16. That the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of a sinner's justification, that this righteousness is re-

ceived through faith and that this faith is the gift of God so that our salvation is wholly of grace.

Article 32. And furthermore I do solemnly promise that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness.

Article 33. That I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith as expressed in the creed by me now repeated together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy religion so far as may appertain to my office according to the best light God shall give me and in opposition not only to atheists and infidels but to Jews, Papists, Mohammedans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and Universalists and to all heresies and errors, ancient and modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ.

That every professor is required to adopt each several article of the creed is evident from the emphatic language of Article 27 in the Associate Statutes. This reads: "It is strictly and solemnly enjoined and left in sacred charge that every article of the above said creed shall forever remain entirely and identically the same without the least alteration, addition, or diminution. . . ." No statute makes allusion to any "substance of doctrine" modifying in any manner the strict interpretation of the creed.

Down through the nineteenth century rich bequests continued to come to Andover. The remembrance of the Unitarian breach of trust seems to have been in the minds of most of the donors. Mr. N. Pike, in bequeathing $1,000 to Andover, wrote "but should that creed cease to be professed and practiced upon in said Institution the said fund shall revert to my heirs forever." Moses Brown leaving $25,000 by will for a professorship in ecclesiastical history made similar specifications. Samuel Hitchcock gave the seminary $15,000 with the stipulation "that none who in the judgment of the faculty and trustees of the institution hold or express doctrinal views in any essential points inconsistent with this creed be allowed to enjoy the benefits of this endowment." A second gift of $50,000 was received by the

trustees with the declaration that he [Mr. Hitchcock] "may rest assured that our board will most gladly and faithfully hold the same in grateful trust in accordance with his desire." "Positive evangelical faith" was required of the holders of the Rice, Draper, and Prudence Holbrook scholarships.[11]

The seminary was still further strengthened by the institution of a Board of Visitors, similar to the Boards of Overseers of Harvard and of Bowdoin. It was to be a permanent institution, "to continue as the sun and the moon forever." Election of professors required their ratification. They were supreme over the trustees, the representatives of the founders in the oversight of the seminary, in the protection of its funds, in the removal of professors for heteredoxy or neglect of duty. By the ninth article of the additional statute it was provided that "the Visitors should take the same pledge as the professors and should repeat it every five years.[12]

The substance of instruction was also indicated. In the eighth article of the Constitution it was required that "under the head of Christian theology shall be comprehended lectures on divine revelation, on the inspiration and truth of the Old and New Testaments as proved by miracles, internal evidence, fulfilment of prophecies and historic facts . . . more particularly on the revealed character of God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost; on the character, offices, atonement and mediation of Jesus Christ . . . on the Scripture doctrines of regeneration, justification, and sanctification; on the eternity of future rewards and punishments as revealed in the Gospel.[13]

The State of Massachusetts formally ratified these arrangements. When in 1889 the seminary applied for "right to hold an increased amount of property" this was allowed "provided the income of said estate shall always be applied to the objects and purposes of the said institution and agreeably to the will of the donors."[14]

Three-quarters of a century of unexampled prosperity followed. "No school of the kind had a nobler history or lent

more glory to its benefactors. . . . Students flocked to Andover from all lands and all Protestant churches. Her professors for nearly a century shed immortal honor on her, on theological science, and the whole church of Christ. Her light went out into all the world. Through the *Bibliotheca Sacra* she taught the best English-speaking clergy of all lands. Andover's publishing house of Draper sent the best theological books into the study of every ambitious minister. Her missionary spirit was vigorous. Her graduates from the very beginning went forth into heathen lands. . . . christianized and civilized whole races and later went also into our own West and planted academies, colleges, and theological schools, built churches and evangelized large portions of our land. She became the model of every theological school in America.

"Yes, she had a glorious history. And it was the outgrowth of the theological and religious spirit of the founders, of that vital and vitalizing faith which came to them from Christ, Paul, the Reformation, Puritanism—the tremendous energy of that evangelicism which founded modern missions and modern reform. The American Educational Society, the American Tract Society, the American Temperance Society, the plan of the eldest religious newspaper in America, and really, though indirectly, both the Congregational and Baptist Missionary societies, all had their origin on that dear and famous Hill. After nearly a century and a quarter the pulsations of her heart are still felt in the energies of a thousand churches."[16]

The story of "liberal" jockeying with the Andover constitution and repudiation of the wishes of the founders is too long to relate in detail. The five professors who broke down the old order were charged with affirming that "the Bible is not the only perfect rule of faith and practice but is fallible and untrustworthy even in some of its religious teachings; that Christ in the day of his humiliation was merely a finite being limited in all his attributes, capacities and attainments" and fourteen other departures from the creed. Professor Smyth denied all and insisted that the creed could be "interpreted" to cover the opinions

of himself and associates.* Their lawyers made use of the usual *ad captandum* arguments of liberalism caught red-handed in other people's property.[17]

"It is monstrous to bribe men to teach what they do not believe. . . . The Phillipses, Browns and Abbotts, noble in their intention and sincere Christians but erring in sound judgment, bedded their little institution on the hills of Andover among the mud and rubbish of extinct controversies." (Dwight.) "This is a prosecution for non-conformity to a certain creed. *Its logical outcome is that you are asked to decide that falsehoods may be taught at Andover."* (Gaston.) "Whatever the professors have published in 'Progressive Orthodoxy' or 'The Andover Review' has no bearing; only what they teach their pupils is relevant." (Dwight.) Prof. Simeon Baldwin insisted that "to understand the creed *one must read between the lines"* as if one could interpret a will after such a fashion.[18]

The Board of Visitors found that "E. C. Smyth maintains and inculcates beliefs inconsistent with and repugnant to the creed of said institution and contrary to the true intent of the founders and adjudged and decreed that he be removed from the office of Brown Professor of Ecclesiastical History."[19] The trustees defended the professors and expressed their sympathy with them. Smyth sat tight.† The court failed to uphold the Visitors' decision. In 1899 the Board of Visitors who by the constitution had themselves to take the Associates' Creed decided

*Consider the fine phrases. "I hold that the creed of the seminary does not bind the institution to an antiquated phase of belief but leads logically to those adjustments of thought and belief which are now necessary and leaves an open path for such as the future may require. . . . At certain points its silences are even more expressive than its utterances. . . . I desire to secure for others after me the rights of a reverent scholarship in the study of God's word. . . . The creed was not intended to forbid progress; it invites to progress. . . . Is the seminary committed to the maintenance of transient opinion or is there a truer interpretation of the creed?"—Prof. E. C. Smyth, *The Andover Creed,* xviii, xxii.

†"The action of the visitors in deposing Prof. Smyth was not taken seriously. . . . When Prof. Smyth went on with his work as if nothing had taken place his course seemed natural and consistent."—W. J. Tucker, *My Generation,* 159.

that the trustees of the seminary had a right to dispense with *public* subscription and the trustees nothing loth abolished it. No change was made in the seminary constitution. The whole destructive procedure was by way of interpretation. Professors were henceforth to be held to "substance of doctrine" merely.

The only bright spot in the whole episode appears in a letter of Prof. J. H. Thayer who resigned his Andover chair and betook himself to the Harvard Divinity School. In the *Congregationalist* of June 14, 1882, he wrote:

"The statutes of the seminary require a rigid assent to the letter of the Creed on the part of all persons subscribing to it; the boards of administration, however, accept a general and approximate belief in the doctrines of the Creed as the sufficient prerequisite to subscription. But the honesty of such general and approximate subscription has of late been publicly and extensively called in question; yet the trustees are disinclined publicly to acknowledge and vindicate it.

"To remain in my office, therefore, would be to remain constantly exposed to the charge or the suspicion of dishonesty without the prospect of open vindication and with the certainty that whatever I might say in my own defence would be largely neutralized. . . .

"But it is asked, 'Why do you not remain at your post and labor there to bring about a change?'

"I reply, 'Because my obligation to be and be known to be an honest man outweighs all other obligations to trustees or seminary. . . . "Yours truly,

"J. Henry Thayer,"[20]

How unique a statement in the history of theological liberalism!

The fate of Andover constitutes a brilliant illustration for a remark made to Pastor Quistorp by the late Prof. Troeltsch. "We cannot use force on the evangelical church but we have another weapon in order to overpower it. That is to appoint the greatest possible number of radical and liberal professors and then it will of itself and from within go to pieces." The

founders of Andover had feared, as they expressed it, "the changing of the fountain of living waters" into "a river of death."[21] The course of Andover after its capture by new theology justified their fears. The number of students began to dwindle. Back in the sixties Dr. Northrop, pleading for funds to establish a Baptist seminary in Chicago, pointed to Andover as an illustration of what a great evangelical seminary could mean for church and nation. "I was present at commencement and saw there at least a thousand men, trained in that school, who had come thither from all parts of the land. I felt then, as never before, the power of such an agency." But these days were now over for Andover.[22] The trustees, Drs. G. A. Gordon, N. Boynton, C. L. Noyes and others decided to transfer the seminary to Cambridge with the desperate idea of attracting students from the large student body of Harvard. This course they justified by the following considerations:

1. The steady falling off in attendance amounting at the present time to a practical desertion of the seminary by students for the ministry.

2. The consequent unproductive use and so far *waste of funds and endowments solemnly consecrated by donors to the great ends of religion.*

3. *The failure, therefore, to fulfil the true design of the Institution* by *"increasing the number of learned and able defenders of the Gospel as well as of orthodox, pious and zealous ministers of the New Testament."*

Who wrote these words is not known to the public. He must have thrust tongue in cheek when he set them down!

The sale of land and buildings at Andover was made without submitting the question of removal and affiliation with Harvard to the Visitors and consequently without obtaining their approval.[23] The splendid Andover site with its beautiful lines of elms, fine campus, historic buildings, splendid Brechin library and all its venerable associations with the past was abandoned and the old seminary tagged to the two little buildings which constituted the Divinity School plant at Harvard.

In grateful recognition President Lowell at the Harvard Commencement of 1909 conferred an honorary degree upon one of the Andover trustees active for the affiliation, in the following phrases: "Charles Lothrop Noyes, pastor and preacher, who in these latter days has helped to bring nearer together those whom the blindness of man had put asunder."[24]

The optimism of those who advised this action seems in the light of subsequent developments little short of hare-brained. Dr. A. P. Fitch declared that "Andover at Cambridge has the greatest opportunity of a generation to do that for the lack of which the American church is languishing at this very moment—intelligently to interpret and justly to exalt the person, authority, and message of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Prof. Evans, who holds the Abbott Chair in Christian Theology which Prof. Park honored through long years, is an Hon. Vice-President of the National Federation of Religious Liberals. Naturally he has none of the foolish qualms of the Samuel Abbott who, as we have seen, withdrew money earmarked for Harvard because of its Unitarianism. "We have no occasion to fear her [Harvard's] influence but rather to rejoice that she has proved to be our great co-worker in helping young men to find and keep the faith."[25] Again the tongue is in the cheek! The *Congregationalist* (Mch. 27:09) joined in approval,

"Those who have taken these responsibilities of training ministers for the churches realize that they are heirs of a great past. . . . Andover has a noble mission yet to be fulfilled. . . . Andover goes to Cambridge to develop there further its own type of evangelical Christian faith. So the new Andover will be the old Andover growing in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, cherished in the affections and prayers of the churches and sending forth their choice youth to preach the Gospel in all the world."

This rhetoric was but the flowers sent to a funeral.

The next act of the drama was soon staged. Dr. W. J. Tucker, himself one of the five professors of the trial in the

eighties, stated what everyone knows: "If Andover Seminary was established to oppose and counteract any influence it was that of Unitarianism. . . . This is an historic fact which none will dispute."[26] But the trustees were not embarrassed by scruples on that score. In June, 1922, they proceeded to merge the seminary with the Harvard Divinity School. The Visitors asked Judge Crosby for an injunction. It was refused!

According to the terms of the new arrangement it was stated that "the continuity and distinct existence as an institution of Andover Theological Seminary shall be maintained, all of its trusts being executed as heretofore." Then with what seems like mockery the public was informed that,

"The president and fellows of Harvard College and the trustees of Andover Theological Seminary shall join to form a non-denominational theological school *with single faculty, roll of students, administration and catalogue.*" What actually was in mind comes out in the following clause,

"Each corporation in determining whether any chair on its foundation shall be filled or left vacant, will endeavor so far as practicable to take such action as may *best contribute to the symmetry and efficiency of the school as a whole.*"[27] The theological symmetry aimed at, we may be sure, was not to be evangelical in the sense of old Andover nor in the remotest degree to approximate it.

Andover can still nominate its professors but appointment rests solely with the governing boards of Harvard University. "In other words no one can teach in the new school without the official appointment of Harvard University, thus as a practical matter taking the whole thing out of the hands of the Trustees and Visitors of Andover."*[28]

*Referring to the appointment of Andover professors by Harvard, President Lowell said before the alumni of Andover, June 13, '22:

"This is of course necessary because the new school is a part of the University and is as completely under its control as every other department. It is a school of the University, by the University and for all God's people." C.R. 1922:586.

The Associate Statutes provided that "no student in this seminary shall ever be charged for instruction" and for a hundred years this

The Andover property brought to the Harvard School of Theology amounts to more than a million dollars; its contribution to the joint library was over 70,000 volumes. [The Harvard Divinity School had 46,000.] One could have wished for the honor of that human nature which is so highly esteemed in "liberal" circles that some Unitarian voice might have been heard protesting, "These funds should not be pooled! It is treason to the explicit agreements made with the donors." But not a whisper was perceptible. Dr. Samuel A. Eliot, in the 1923 report of the American Unitarian Association, says: "The combination of the Harvard Divinity School and the Andover Theological Seminary has preserved two noble traditions and provided a liberal professional school exceptionally rich in equipment." What it has done is to complete the destruction of a noble tradition. The new school is rich in equipment, ignobly rich. In student body it is as impoverished as ever.

The bust of Prof. Edwards A. Park stands aloft in the Gothic library of Andover Hall where I suppose it gravely listens on occasion to "Kind Mother of Truth," the school hymn of the old Unitarian seminary, wafted from the near-by chapel. I recall, as a boy, sitting opposite the great theologian at the table in my father's home. He was speaking in the course of his conversation of the sufferings of Christ and found himself unable to control his emotions. But the author of "Kind Mother of Truth," a professor-emeritus in the joint school, can bring himself to write of our Lord Jesus Christ as "a man of sin."

The Theological School of Harvard University is "nonsectarian." This word has in connection with the Harvard Divinity School a significant history. In the last century the

was the case. It is no longer so. The tuition is $150. Scholarships funds were in most instances given for "needy and indigent" students. They are now used for fellowships and scholarships [two of $800 and two of $700] for students of highest standing. Tuition in every case is first deducted so that money intended for poor students is used to pay salaries of professors.—*Brief for the Visitors,* 77 and 12.

presence of the Unitarian Divinity School at Harvard was felt to be a distinct disadvantage to the college as hindering the recruiting of college students. The University, therefore, attempted to break the connection between itself and its theological incubus, but was prevented by the courts.*[30] So the Unitarian school was declared "non-sectarian" and at times professors, whose theology made their departure from evangelical schools desirable, became the nominal representatives

*The Massachusetts courts extended a sheltering wing over the Unitarian Divinity School (Harvard Coll. vs. Soc.) "The court cannot . . . direct the withdrawal of the funds above described and others of like character from the supervision and trust of that permanent corporate body to which they were instructed by their donors for the purpose of maintaining a theological school as a branch of the university and commit them to an independent board of trustees to be appropriated to maintaining a separate theological school. . . . A contrary decision would furnish a precedent dangerous to the perpetuity and sacredness of our great public charities, leaving the question of the management and supervision of our public charities to be the subject of change with every fluctation of popular opinion as to what may be the more expedient and useful mode of administering them."—*Brief for Visitors,* 85.

The following two passages appear in the same number of the *Christian Register,* 1922:586 and 583:

President Lowell *loquitur.* "The process of making the Harvard Divinity school non-sectarian has been going on for many years. It was heartily fostered by President Eliot and it went so far that on May 20, 1906, he and the corporation assured the Carnegie Foundation that "in Harvard University no denominational test is imposed . . . nor any denominational tenets or doctrines taught to students."

Dr. Dieffenbach *loquitur.* [He is speaking of President Lowell's Jewish policy.] After dwelling on Harvard's unvarying hospitality to all races and creeds he says of the Unitarians' theological bloodbrethren, the Jews, "It is obvious that some method must be devised that will keep the number of Jews within such limits as will assure for the student body and institution as a whole a reasonably united and harmonious community. . . . If the Jews cannot be fully accommodated there is opportunity for them in institutions where they may have training as good as that in Harvard."

A fund of $150,000 has been given for the maintenance of religious work in Harvard University upon the principles now adopted in the administration of Appleton Chapel. If these change *the endowment is to revert to the American Unitarian Association.* C.R. 1915:220.

In order to secure the benefits of the Carnegie Pension Fund, Bowdoin College turned over to Andover Theological Seminary $56,118 of the Stone bequest which had been received by the college to be used *as long as it represented the religious and doctrinal views of the orthodox Congregational churches of New England.* This money is now in the control of the Harvard Theological School!

of other churches than the Unitarian on the "non-sectarian" faculty. On the strength of this dubious "non-sectarianism" the professors of this essentially Unitarian school have been eligible to pensions from the Carnegie Fund, pensions which could never be obtained by theological professors elsewhere.

The magnitude of the, at least, implicit prevarication which has accompanied the Andover "capture," is such as to be almost humorous. The Andover trustees and the president and fellows of Harvard College say that *the instruction given in the theological school at Harvard University by Andover professors is orthodox* and is consistent with the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism and with the creed set out in the Associate Statutes of Andover Theological Seminary,* as said confession and creed have for many years been interpreted and applied by the plaintiffs, and that such instruction is not different in its theological tendencies from that given for many years past in Andover Theological Seminary. As to the instruction given in the Theological School in Harvard University by persons

Visitors of the Theological Institution at Andover vs. Trustees of Andover Theological Seminary and others, Exhibit C.

Statement of Andover Trustees: "Its [Harvard Divinity] faculty has been composed of Trinitarians." [e. g., Prof. G. F. Moore!] "Prof. Kirsopp Lake belongs to the Church of England. Prof. La Piana is a Catholic priest of modernist type. While the evidence did not disclose the denominational connection of Profs. Ford and Davison it appeared that both of them *were regular attendants at Appleton Chapel"!—Report of the Master in Equity,* 109.

Fine old Calvinists one and all!

*Yet the present trustees state to the Massachusetts Supreme Court "that the Andover Theological Seminary is not now and never has been subject to any denominational or sectarian control *or committed to the propagation of any particular doctrines* except that by the terms of certain donations referred to in the will the professors or students who receive the benefit thereof are required to be Congregational or Presbyterian or to hold certain doctrinal views *none of which requirements are in any way affected or impaired by the Plan of Closer Affiliation*" with the Harvard School.—*Visitors vs. Trustees,* 53.

When, however, money is to be raised the shoe is on the other foot. The Master in Equity calls attention to the fact that "in 1921 when efforts were made by the trustees of Andover Theological Seminary to raise an endowment *the appeal was limited to Trinitarian Congregationalists."—Master's Report,* 103.

other than Andover professors, these defendants say that, so far as such instruction has any theological complexion, *"the same is for the most part substantially the same as that of the instruction given by the Andover professors."*[31]

Paris is worth a mass!

In the words of Mr. Weston, attorney for the Visitors, "We have Andover Theological Seminary founded by orthodox Trinitarians bound to a specific creed which cannot be varied; founded for the purpose of combatting Unitarianism and other doctrines by the founders regarded as unorthodox. We have the Harvard Divinity School founded as a Unitarian school and until recently continued as such; and of late years a supposedly non-sectarian school pledged in the strongest language to the Carnegie Pension Fund that no creed or sectarian doctrine of any kind is or can be taught. These two institutions agree that there shall be 'no rivalry or competition.' Andover must teach according to the creed, Harvard cannot teach according to the creed; they cannot in the nature of things be anything but rivals and competitors. If the Andover professors are to live up to these requirements and their oaths of office, how can they teach in harmony with an institution linked to the Carnegie Pension system?

"The intention of the founders of Andover Theological Seminary was for the teaching of a certain well-defined and carefully described kind of theology, that is orthodox, evangelical, Trinitarian, in accordance with the Westminster catechism and the Andover creed; not a comprehensive scheme of theological education. The Constitution is most specific. The Founders were not interested in general theological nonsectarian or undenominational education. To them the particular, important thing was the combatting of certain ideas along theological educational lines which Harvard and the professors of divinity in Harvard stood for, to which they were most strongly opposed."[32]

Unitarians themselves know how to appraise this "non-sectarianism." While "the president and fellows of Harvard

University deny that the Divinity School is teaching or has for many years taught the doctrines and principles of the Christian denomination or sect called or known as Unitarian,"[33] Dr. S. A. Eliot affirms that "the Unitarian churches have for a hundred years largely depended upon the Harvard Divinity School for the supply of churches."[34] *"No one can rightly think that the school has ceased to be Unitarian because it is no longer a Unitarian school,"* said Dr. J. W. Day in reviewing the hundredth anniversary of the Harvard Divinity School.[35] *"Manchester College at Oxford calls itself non-sectarian,"* writes Rev. G. C. Cressey [Unitarian], *"but it is really more Unitarian than ever. . . . So with the Harvard Divinity School and practically with the newly-formed theological school in Harvard University."*[36] And an editorial in the *Christian Register* says: *"The Unitarian church may be sure the spirit in the theological school at Harvard University is in harmony with the Unitarian spirit and needs."*[37]

But is not the dean of the joint school a Congregationalist? It's the old shell game. Dean Sperry is a Congregationalist and vice-president of the Free Religious Association which represents the radical wing of the Unitarian body.[38] Regarding Andover, Dean Sperry has recently written:

"In general, members of the orthodox or Trinitarian branch of Congregationalism are humbly and gratefully mindful of the fact that it was Unitarians who over all the middle of the last century bore the brunt of the attack upon a more and more incredible Calvinism and won, not only for themselves, but for their more laggard brethren of orthodoxy, that victory. *Unitarianism might well claim that to the victors belong the spoils.** . . . In this closer affiliation at Harvard, the Divinity School has generously welcomed the sons of orthodox Andover into the places of freedom and has waited and

*"Andover at Cambridge," wrote an alumnus of Andover to the *Report of the Committee of Conference of the Andover Alumni Association,* Dec. 1906, "will bear the same relation to the old seminary that a scalp at the belt of an Indian bears to the man from whose head it was taken."

watched with patient good humor the legal difficulties into which Andover has been plunged by founders who tried to be wiser than posterity."[39]

"To the victors belong the spoils." Having stripped the prostrate form, the victors proceed to dance upon it. The Unitarian ministers directly after the merger took place, with incredible tactlessness, went to Andover to hold their Institute. They were in fine fettle. In the assignment of rooms in the old Andover dormitories, cards were used with such jocose names as Tophet, Canaan, Babylon, the Dead Sea. A mock trial, "the most elaborate and hilarious we ever saw," was staged in which Albertus Carolus Dieffenbachus was finally acquitted of the charge of "Fundamentalism." "In the early days a Unitarian meeting on the Hill would have been inconceivable,"[40] wrote one reporter, and another with upward roll of eyes, "I feel sure that if the sainted Andover theologians could have walked among us, those devout and scholarly men who made this school of learning famous, would have given us of the other wing of Congregationalism their blessing. They now see with larger eyes than when they were here in the flesh, and we are one in the unity of the spirit."[41]

The hunter had hardly disappeared in the distance with the dead swan on his back, than the geese, too, were seen nibbling the bait. In the catalogue of the Harvard Divinity School are listed students from the Episcopal School, Cambridge, from the Boston University School (Methodist), and from Newton Theological Institution (Baptist). The Harvard theological seminarist must pay $150 per annum; *students in these outlying schools may take Harvard theological courses without charge.* Indeed the Harvard authorities with an artless munificence have even thrown open to Newton students what President Horr calls "the famous Williams scholarships of $500 each"—famous no doubt from the fact that the founder was a Boston rum-seller in an earlier day. King's Chapel [Unitarian] has organized a "seminary week," at which President Horr appears on "Newton day," and the representatives of Harvard, Boston

and the Episcopal School at appointed times,* but even the most accomplished effrontery could not go through the mockery of an Andover day. President Horr lectures in the Unitarian summer school for ministers at Harvard, and Newton professors are frequent preachers at King's Chapel and Arlington St. [Unitarian churches].[42] Drs. Peabody, Fenn, Jacks, and Dieffenbach, appear on Newton Hill and President Lowell of Harvard is picked as the prominent figure of the Newton centenary celebration in 1925. When the Baptist theological professors of the country held a conference in Boston the Harvard Divinity School proffered them a dinner,[43] and in

*President Lowell of Harvard before the Boston Baptist Social Union: "It is a great pleasure to speak before the Baptist Social Union and more especially on this night which is devoted to the Newton Theological Seminary, because that Seminary and Harvard and Andover and the Episcopal Theological School and the School of Theology of the Boston University *have all been very close together of late years and acting in harmony.*

"President Horr says I brought together members of a lot of different denominations. It was he who did it. He was the *liaison* and I was the *camouflage.* Seventy-four different schools were represented on that occasion. . . . *President Horr discovered that all Protestant ministers are on the same side and he proved it."—Commencement Bulletin, Newton Theo. Institute,* Vol. 12, No. 1.

At the 75th anniversary of the Unitarian Seminary at Meadville Prof. Rowe appeared as "fraternal delegate" from Newton. President Southworth, a former Baptist, in recognition of this gesture remarked, "The world moves. . . . All this is a foreshadowing of the time when the intrusion of the sectarian spirit into theological training will become a sin against the Holy Ghost. The ministerial training schools of the different denominations [are] much nearer together than the denominations themselves, for scholarship knows no sectarian limitations."—*Report of the Anniversary,* 208. [Published by the University of Chicago.]

The *Newton Bulletin* No. 4, Vol. 9, 3, remarks: "It is well to proclaim the estimate which Harvard puts upon the quality of Newton's instruction and faculty as seen in the announcement that Newton students are admitted to Harvard courses without conditions and that Harvard requests for her students the same freedom to take courses at Newton, thus making the relation reciprocal." Three pages later announcement is made that the degree of Master of Theology has been conferred on C. F. Potter.

A little later Mr. Potter passed into Unitarianism. In the *Fundamentalist,* May 15, '24, he is reported as saying that "on his graduation a half dozen of the leading men of the class met in his room after the exercises were over and in a comparison of views all agreed that they were Unitarian in belief. Five of them stated that they would

recognition of this courtesy, President Horr with Unitarian help rounded up the representatives of all the seminaries at a Harvard summer conference, which the *Christian Register* declares "an historic meeting of American Christendom."[44] In the atmosphere of good-feeling of these "union movements," the divisive truths of Christianity naturally drop in the background and this no doubt is the purpose of Unitarian strategists.

When it was announced that Boston University students were to be permitted to take part of their course in the Harvard Divinity School, the organ of New England Methodism declared: "We confess we are not a little disturbed. When proposals were made by Harvard some years ago, looking toward the removal of Andover to Cambridge, evangelical circles were profoundly stirred and pained." It insisted on the unwisdom of having "men in the formative period of their theological career under the influence of the theological atmosphere, which admittedly predominates at Harvard. . . . The union

stay in the Baptist denomination and try to put their views across," but Mr. Potter came out into the open.

Nor did the founders of the Episcopal School anticipate any teaching in it or to its students which would be congenial to Harvard Unitarians. The trust deed states with definiteness what the school was to stand for.

"The instruction and teachings of the School and of its professors and lecturers *shall always be in conformity with the doctrine,* ritual and orders, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America as set forth in the book of Common Prayer and the Canons of the church and *shall at all times embody and distinctly set forth the great doctrine of Justification by Faith alone in the Atonement and Righteousness of Christ* as taught in the Articles of Religion commonly called the Thirty-Nine Articles [Scriptures alone being the standard] as adopted at the Reformation. . . ."

More than fifty years ago Harvard Unitarians invited the Methodist Theological school to establish itself under the eaves of their college. The invitation was declined. C.R. 1911:421. Roman Catholics also complain of these "leavening" manipulations. The *Sacred Heart Review,* Jan. 13, 1900, wrote: "There are those, having the means of knowing, who say that for years back the head of Harvard University has systematically labored by every means in his control to bring about a condition which would compel all Catholic young men in this section of the country who are desirous of a college education to go to Harvard for it."

in this way of the two institutions is certain to cause serious concern and deep grief to many devout souls . . . loyal to the distinguishing characteristics of Methodism. They will see in this alliance a radical departure from those theological affirmations that are dear to them as their very lives. What would our Methodist fathers say to such a combination?"[45]

These affiliations one naturally interprets as a part of that campaign of infiltration which Unitarians so often declare to be their mission. It should be noticed that at the very time that Newton Institution was entering upon these relationships, American Baptists were being called on to raise one hundred millions for church purposes, the gigantic slice of $800,000 being assigned to the Lilliputian school on Newton Hill. What protection is there against the Andoverization of these endowments in the next generation? The *Christian Register* already lists Newton as "scientific," one of the few seminaries in the country with "the new atmosphere in which religious teachings are given by men who are thoroughly open-minded," putting it in brackets with Harvard, Union, and that hearth of piety, the Divinity School of the University of Chicago.[46] Dr. S. A. Eliot expresses the hope that "the co-operative goodwill that animates the theological schools in Berkeley, California, may some day become an actual combination as in the case of Harvard-Andover."[47] The schools referred to are: Baptist, Congregational, and Unitarian.

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER VI

1. *The Andover Case,* 107. 2. Eddy, *The Unitarian Apostasy,* 23. 3. *The Andover Case,* vii. 4. *Annals of Amherst College,* 11 and 56. 5. Wood's *History of Andover Theological Seminary,* 59. 6. *Id.* 61. 7. *Id.* 76. 8. *Id.* 238. 9. *Prof. Park and his Pupils,* 113. 10. Woods, *Id.* 257. 11. *Statement of Th. Weston,* attorney for the Visitors. 12. Woods, 250-3. 13. Woods, 236. 14. *Acts of 1889,* ch. 55. 15. *The Andover Case,* 208. 16. Faulkner, *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1923, 458, "The Tragic Fate of a Famous Seminary." 17. *Andover Case,* xiv, xix, xvii. 18. *Id.* 7, xxv, xviii, xxiv. 19. *Id.* 191. 20. *Id.* 151. 21. *Id.* 105. 22. *Address in Behalf of a Christian University and Seminary in Chicago,* 1867. 23. *Brief for Visitors,* 51. 24. *Religious History of New England,* 133. 25. Addresses at Induction of Drs. Evans and Fitch, 26 and 21. 26. *The Andover Defence,* 277. 27. *Statement of Th. Weston for Visitors.* 28. *Brief for the Visitors,* 77. 29. *One Hundredth Anniversary of Harvard Divinity School,* 84. 30. *Report of Committee of Overseers of Harvard College,*

1858. 31. *Visitors of Andover vs. Trustees,* 84-86. 32. *Brief for the Visitors,* 72. 33. *Visitors of Andover vs. Trustees,* 93. 34. C.R. 1923:371. 35. C.R. 1916:978. 36. C.R. 1923:369. 37. C.R. 1922:582. 38. C.R. 1916:525. 39. C.R. 1924: Oct. 16. 40. C.R. 1922:681-2. 41. C.R. 1922:684. 42. C.R. 1921:330. 43. C.R. 1918:802. 44. C.R. 1918:773. 45. Quoted from *Zion's Herald* in C.R. 1915:263. 46. C.R. 1924:1067. 47. C.R. 1922:759.

CHAPTER VII

THE APOSTATE SEMINARIES

Und eure Weisheit macht den irren Geist noch irrer.
—Lessing.

THE men who founded Union Theological Seminary were Puritans as were the founders of Andover. Absalom Peters organized the American Missionary Society and was the greatest promoter of home missions of the time. Education also was a major interest with him. It was he who started the *American Journal of Education.* William Patton gave the initial impulse to the Evangelical Alliance, which held its first session in London in 1846. Joseph Otis was the founder of the Seamen's Friend Society and the Seamen's Bank for Savings. Others were active in educational and missionary enterprises. Among the early directors were men like Albert Barnes, Anson G. Phelps, Jr., John Center Baldwin and William E. Dodge. At the start the seminary had a hard struggle and Prof. Henry B. Smith used to declare that he dreaded calling on the treasurer for his salary, so often had he gone home empty-handed.[2] Collections were made in the churches and solicitors even went into factories and to farms for subscriptions of a dollar upward.[3] But with the *res angustae* went high thinking and piety. Union, as Andover, trained a splendid contingent of missionaries. Its theologians were among the great figures of the Christian life in America; Edward Robinson, Henry B. Smith, Profs. Shedd and Schaff, and President William Adams.

In order to ensure the evangelical loyalty of the seminary in years to come the directors in 1853 added to the constitutional clause, which gave them the power to alter the constitution, an amendment limiting this power to change "to

consistency with the doctrinal basis as now subscribed by the directors."[4] It was made an *irrevocable* part of the constitution that every director and professor should declare his approval of the Westminster Confession. Each member of the faculty was required to subscribe to the following statement triennially and in the presence of the Board:

"I believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practise; and I do now in the presence of God and the directors of this seminary solemnly and sincerely receive and adopt the Westminster Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. I do also in like manner approve of the Presbyterian form of government and I do solemnly promise that I will not teach or inculcate anything which shall appear to me to be subversive of the said system of doctrine. . . . so long as I shall continue to be a professor in this seminary."

Refusal to repeat this statement on the part of the professor meant immediate dismissal.

In 1870, Union Seminary gave to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church the right to veto appointments to its faculty. When, however, the Assembly attempted to use this right in the case of Prof. Briggs, it promptly withdrew it (1892), and in 1905 substituted for the standards which had prevailed for fifty years, the colorless statement that "all members of the faculty shall satisfy the board of their Christian faith and life."[5]

Whereat, up in Cambridge, President Eliot rubbed his hands exultingly. [Eliot. *More Harvard Graduates for the Ministry,* 29.]

"This action," [abolishing subscription to the Westminster Confession], observed President Francis Brown, "must not be understood as a departure from the original principles of the seminary. On the contrary, it was their natural consummation. If subscription was abolished, it was not that we wished to believe less, but that we might be free to believe more."[6]

Certainly it has not worked out that way!

In the winter of 1925 a student at Union committed suicide and the report went out that in his Bible was found written opposite one of the great resurrection passages: "It's not all bunk as Professor —— says." It is hard to think of the head of an historic theological seminary expressing doubt as to a future life. Yet one can with difficulty interpret otherwise the words of President McGiffert, at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the divinity school of the University of Chicago.

"During all the Christian centuries [the doctrine of immortality] has been regarded as a fundamental doctrine of religion of such a character, that doubt of it must destroy religious faith altogether. But in recent years as a result of many influences, among which the scientific tendency not to transcend the limits of experience is one, the belief in immortality has become less and less controlling. Theologians are not so inclined as they once were to dogmatize upon the subject. The very title of a recent work upon immortality, *The Christian Hope,* by a colleague of mine, illustrates the modern attitude. Or one may go still further and say that many Christians, because the life after death lies beyond the range of experimental proof, have grown indifferent about it and are turning their attention to other things of more immediate and practical concern."[7]

Equally cloudy is Dr. McGiffert's testimony regarding theism. In his N. W. Taylor lecture at Yale, 1922, on "The God of the Early Christians," he defends the strange thesis that "the early Gentile converts to Christianity may well have taken Christ as their Lord and Saviour without taking his God and Father as their God."

"There was no antecedent reason," he continues, "why the Gentile Christians should accept the God of the Jews whom Jesus worshipped any more than the Jewish ceremonial law which he observed and the Jewish practices in which he was brought up."[8]

The only motive for such a strained construction seems to be that which Prof. Machen finds. "Dr. McGiffert is seeking a precursor in early Christianity for *the non-theistic modernism which he himself holds.*"[9]

It was President McGiffert's *Christianity in the Apostolic Age* which gave Dr. Rihbany his first push into Unitarianism.[10] This book scissors the New Testament history into shreds. Let us look at a few passages.

Of the Lord's Supper, Dr. McGiffert says: "It is not absolutely certain that Jesus himself actually instituted such a supper and directed his disciples to eat and drink in remembrance of him as Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:24."

But what has set this fact in uncertainty?

The answer comes, "Expecting as he did to return at an early day he *can hardly have been* solicitous to provide for the preservation of his memory."

The writer of the Acts was far removed from the time and "*could hardly avoid* investing even familiar occurrences with marvel and mystery."

So of the account of Elymas. "It was natural that Luke finding in his sources, as he probably did, a reference to Paul's meeting such a man should picture the scene as an exhibition of the superior power of Christianity in the very field in which Bar Jesus and his kind were most skilful" [in other words, should concoct an appropriate story]. "*He could hardly conceive* of Paul as coming into contact with such a man and not giving convincing evidence of his mightier control over the forces of nature and it *may have been* a denunciation by Paul of the spiritual blindness of the Magian that led him to suppose that the apostle inflicted physical blindness upon him."

Tradition one would think should, other things being equal, be entered upon the credit rather than on the debit side of historical conclusion. But this natural presupposition is reversed in these circles: "The tradition which makes Luke the author of the third Gospel and of the book of Acts can hardly

be maintained." "It is altogether improbable that the epistle to the Hebrews . . . was addressed to Jewish Christians at all. *It is true that 'pros Hebraious' is found in all our Mss.* . . . But no weight can be attached to it." "It seems necessary to conclude that the author of the Acts was not identified with the eyewitnesses who appear in certain parts of his book. . . . The admonitions to Timothy and Titus in the pastoral epistles were not really intended for them. It looks very much as if they were simply lay figures and the two letters were intended not for them but for the church at large."[11]

So the sands shift. Nothing is certain. Discussion is interminable as among the schoolmen of mediæval Paris and its unsupported assertionalism finally brings one to an impatient closing of the book.

Prof. Lyman's theism is as little like New Testament theism as President's McGiffert's. In his inaugural address in 1918 he insisted that "the God of a democratic theism will not have sovereignty as his chief attribute. He will be like Jesus, sometimes denied, sometimes betrayed. . . . The postulate of a democratic God as the supreme power in the universe can be verified from the facts of experience. . . . The verification consists in the trend of evolution towards world democracy. . . . If we feel in our hearts a passion for democracy as the richest, noblest form of human life; if we are gaining some clear, convincing insight as to how a better democracy than we now possess may be achieved . . . then we are already having the kind of experience that belongs to a life with God, with the only kind of God in whom, as the defenders of the democratic ideal, we ought to believe.

"If, as we look abroad upon human society, we see there a mighty purpose to defend the democracy we already have and to develop a new and better one . . . then we have all the material we need for the experience of actually co-working with God in the world. And this experience so far as it brings new strength and insight for social service supplies cumulative evidence for the reality of a democratic God."[12]

The address at the opening of the 87th seminary year was delivered by Prof. Fagnani. The Pharisee of the gospel was, for self-satisfaction, not "in it" a moment with this Sadducee. "What is our greatest and most fundamental personal need? I say this with all possible emphasis. It is that we should have a sense of our individual importance and of the wealth of our latent capacity, an impressive recognition of our personal worth and consequence.

"This indispensable faith in ourselves is a profoundly religious thing, for it is simply faith in God our Heavenly Father reduced from abstraction and vain aspiration to practise and actuality. For a man to say he believes in God and at the same time to despise himself and feel only contempt or despair for his own possibilities of good and achievement is a contradiction in terms."

If, then, man is such an admirable creature, it were folly for him to concern himself with salvation from his sins. "It might be subject to question," continues this theologian, "how far one was entitled to call himself a Christian in any complete and adequate sense whose religion is chiefly concerned with his personal salvation in another world and with doctrines, assent to which he therefore calls fundamental."[13]

In the old evangelical days, professors at Union had at times literally to "raise" their own salaries, but the present has a broader margin for its page. The toilsome life in the English Gothic buildings on Morningside is relieved by periods of travel abroad. Prof. G. A. Johnston Ross, returning from delightful sabbatical saunterings in the Far East, spoke of his observations there in an address at the opening of the seminary in 1921. The religions of China and Japan had made a profound dint on his thinking. He declared himself "deeply impressed by the variety of stimuli used by the Chinese toward the achievement of a goodness which in numberless cases is unanswerably authentic and real."

Among these he lists the cult of the dead, the worship of Kwannon [the Chinese Goddess of Mercy] and of

Gautama Buddha. "I believe," he quotes approvingly, "that long ago the Christ and the Buddha have met in that large world of the spirit and I cannot but believe that it was *a meeting marked by mutual love and veneration.* . . . The triumph of Christ would mean not the defeat of Buddha, but the perfecting of that which Buddha began."

Naturally, "the monstrous menace of the Bible Union League" should "be driven from the mission field." It would imperil all such religious harmonies.

Naturally, too, conversion is as unnecessary for those at home as for the Chinese. After referring to the free-thinkers Starbuck, James, and Leuba, he continues: "We older men see that religion by convulsion is to give way to religion by education. . . . I shall never forget—only elderly men here can remember—the shock first of Starbuck and next of James. At first these people seemed to be doing something worse than botanizing on one's mother's grave. They seemed to be impiously endeavoring to dissect not even a human body, but the divine spirit. Yet slowly, slowly, the new learning began to grip. One's faith in cataclysmal religion began to fail. One grew ashamed of associating religion with abnormal psychic states."

Current theology, he concludes, quoting Prof. Leuba, bears to psychology a relation similar to that of alchemy to chemistry.[14]

One can but think of that great Christian layman who so largely made it possible for the present staff at Union to live, the elder Wm. E. Dodge, a Union director for twenty-seven years. Dr. Prentiss, the historian of the seminary, says of him:

"He cherished a profound conviction of the reality and desirableness of revivals. He constantly prayed for them and when he found himself in the midst of them, his whole mind and heart were stirred. The evangelistic labors of such men as Nettleton, Finney, and Moody, had his warmest sympathy."[15]

The protagonist of these psychological theories at Union is Prof. G. A. Coe* of the department of religious education and psychology. His point of view is quickly determined by reference to two books, *The Religion of a Mature Mind* and *The Psychology of Religion.* God is immanent, hence "there can be no higher destiny or duty for us than just to be our whole selves." Naturally, then prayer for help from without becomes a futile thing. "In God's order the world is to be made over into the kingdom of Christ not by the easy way of begging the Almighty to do the work, but by the vastly harder road of doing it ourselves." There can be no talk here of the school of prayer. Even though "prayer is one of the characteristic facts of the life of Jesus, yet the increasing assimilation of his teaching of the fatherhood of God takes the emphasis out of our own prayers." "The belief in the immanence of God," says Prof. Coe, "has a wondrous power of dissolving things." Sure enough and here are some of the things which have gone into the crucible. "We have learned that Monday is as holy as Sunday; that doing the duties of life is as religious as prayer; that God is as near to us in the merchandise as in the communion cup." The sense of sin, too, is gone. "One may be pardoned for doubting whether it ever did work the great good that has been attributed to it." This "is not to be interpreted as a hardening of conscience. The decline in the sense of sin and a growth in the sense of Christian duty" have an essential relation. It is "the displacement of a lower by a higher type of Christian experience."

*Wm. E. Dodge was a distinguished pioneer in the movement against alcohol but this professor sees in alcohol a vehicle of religious education. After explaining to the church that it "must secularize God" he goes on to show how that may be done: "Sin itself," he tells us, "is a quest for God,—a blundering quest but a quest for all that. The man who got dead drunk last night did so because of the impulse within him to break through the barriers of his limitations, to express himself and to realize the more abundant life. His self-indulgence just came to that; he wanted, if only for a brief hour, to live the larger life, to expand the soul, to enter untrodden regions and gather to himself new experiences. That drunken debauch was a quest for life, a quest for God."—Quoted in HORSCH, *Modern Religious Liberalism,* 121.

"The Christian consciousness is moving toward a point where the supreme question of life will be not, 'Am I saved?' but, 'What am I good for?' . . . The modern man cannot be scared by the thought of death or judgment. Naturally, then, we do not catch our breath at the thought of what may be. . . . God is an ideal *socius*, rather than monarch."

There is nothing sacrosanct in religion which "science" is not justified in examining and explaining. It has "no claim to exemption from this taking to pieces." All can be accounted for on anthropological genetic grounds. Baptism is a residual of lustration, the Lord's Supper of the totemistic eating of the god. "From purification ceremonies intended to remove the effects of broken taboo grew the notion of a purification of the heart. Spells and incantations grew into prayers for favor; these grew into aspiration for universal righteousness." It is as plain as the nose on the face. "Christians who refuse to pray except in the name of Jesus display [benighted creatures] an attitude that is obviously a survival of the magical use of names."

Repentance and conversion are susceptible to psychological explanation. "The twice-born type which is characterized by acute and persistent feeling of powerlessness to unify one's life with consequent yielding up of self to some supposedly external 'redemptive' person . . . is probably determined by some persistent, though not yet defined, physiological depression." The joy which often accompanies conversion, this materialist compares with the feeling of exaltation which follows awakening from anæsthesia. "It is nothing more or less than the effect of religious laughing gas."

Prof. Coe minimizes conversion at every point. The regeneration of down-and-outs at the Water Street mission is merely the resurgence from the subconscious of the religion of childhood. Here as elsewhere the subconscious explains all. Religious impressions such as that this or that is one's duty, that God is personally present, that this or that is the witness of the Spirit, are reduced to subconscious products. The conviction of answered prayer is really auto-suggestion. Prof. Coe

describes the stages of self-hypnotization. "He begins with some idea of God . . . received from instruction or from current tradition. He commonly retires to a quiet place or to a place having mental associations of a religious cast in order to 'shut out the world.' This beginning of concentration is followed by closing the eyes which excludes a mass of irrelevant impressions. The body bows, kneels, or assumes some other posture that requires little muscular tension and that may favor extensive relaxations" . . . and so on.

"Religion is wholly within the natural psychological order," is the affirmation of Prof. Coe. The supernatural in Paul's career [perhaps in our Lord's too] is reducible to psychopathic explanation. There are "signs of neurotic make-up in Paul and Mohammed" far more abundantly than in Jesus. "Paul had a luxuriant experience of the sort of automatisms that might have made him a great leader of the shamanistic type. [Shamans are Mongolian devil priests and exorcists.] Though he [Jesus] appears to have experienced some automatisms that he interprets as special divine impartations, these were not the staple of his reliance for himself or for others. *That is, of shamanism there are only minor traces.* Neither Jesus nor Buddha was made weak or inefficient by automatisms that he may have experienced; neither trafficked in them after the manner of the Shaman."

Prof. Coe is engaged in preparing teachers in religion for the young of the country. He is one of the lights of the Religious Education Association.[16]

I wonder if Prof. Scott had his colleague Prof. Coe in mind when he remarked, "The new intellectual currency consists for the most part of raw theories and catchwords which have just about the same value as Russian paper money. There is a general feeling that all our counsellors are lying to us. . . . even professors. . . . It is only the New Testament that speaks the truth."

Yet what kind of a New Testament does Prof. Scott leave us? In his inaugural in 1919 he declared it "a fact no longer

to be questioned" that "some of our cherished Christian beliefs are in part a heritage from ancient paganism." "We cannot unreservedly accept the testimony of the fourth Gospel on any matter of historical fact." "The fourth evangelist was not one of the original witnesses of the life of Jesus." This gospel "lacks the warm colors and definite outlines of personal reminiscence." Just what Profs. Torrey and Montgomery, however, do find in it. "It is not the life of Jesus which is set before us but the history of the Logos." . . . The stories of the baptism, the temptation, the agony, the cry from the cross "could not be reconciled with the theory of the Logos and had therefore to be omitted. Place is given to the mystical ideas which had already begun to grow up around the Lord's Supper under the influence of Greek and Oriental theosophy."[17]

"It is sometimes with a pang that we see conclusions which it took a century to reach, going back into the melting pot," says Prof. Scott. Union has for a generation been a centre for this futile theorizing. "The God of all grace who hath called us into his eternal glory . . . establish, strengthen, settle you." That's the ideal for a school set to train leaders for the church.

It was an ideal up to which the great Andover master John Adams lived and which ennobled the career of his son, President W. A. Adams of Union. Prof. Wm. Adams Brown is in the blood succession of these two saints. He teaches theology in present-day Union. In an article in the *Harvard Theological Review* he tells us how he once walked the midnight streets of New York with Dr. Grenfell in earnest discussion. Suddenly Grenfell stopped abruptedly with the words, "I wish I were back in Labrador. It is much easier to know what is right in Labrador than it is in New York city."

No wonder he was confused. Back in the fifties Prof. Henry B. Smith had said, "The great alternative of our time is Christ or Spinoza." Prof. Brown by affirming that "God is not thought of as separate from the universe, but rather as its immanent law" definitely aligns himself with the Amsterdam Jew. The *consummatum est* of Calvary has no meaning for him.

"Salvation is not an act wrought once for all in some transcendent realm. It is a process going on through the ages and rooted as truly as sin itself in the nature of man. Atonement is not the great exception. It is the universal law of true living."[18] One cannot better characterize the theology of present-day Union than in the inaugural words of Prof. H. B. Smith in 1855: "The terms of specific Christian truth may be retained, but their soul is eaten out by a strange fire. . . . A parasitic naturalism is feeding its own life with the grace which it supplants."[19]

Prof. H. S. Coffin, in an address at the seminary, speaks of the denial of the Virgin Birth as "an absurdly unimportant heresy."[20] Prof. Fosdick's rejections of Christian truth are public property. A stenographer sent into his class room brought out a flat repudiation of the resurrection of our Lord.

"Wheresoever the carcass is. . . ." The bones of Andover have been picked white. The Unitarians are now gathering about Union. One notices announcements of lectures by Drs. W. L. Sullivan and F. G. Peabody; of John Haynes Holmes, J. H. Randall and S. A. Eliot conducting prayers in the seminary chapel. President Eliot's name appears on the letter-head of the new endowment campaign. The English free-thinker Conybeare is invited to lecture to Union students; also Prof. Lake of the Harvard Theological School.

Out of this atmosphere and saturated with teaching such as has been quoted come the youngsters to plague the church. Knowles Taylor, a Union founder, wrote in the early days, "When you become an old gray-headed Elder and meet in the General Assembly the men who received their education at our seminary and hear them magnify the Word of God and see that they are sound and faithful Bible teachers, you will rejoice and bless God for what you see and hear."[21] How different the fact! Union graduates are the perplexity of ordaining councils.* Yet they make their way into the strategic

*"I am about to be graduated from an undenominational seminary," writes one of these Union seniors, the Rev. A. A. Hunter in the *Century*

places of the church. The alumni catalogue gives their present status—presidents and professors of mission colleges, teachers in theological seminaries, Bible professors in colleges, directors of religious education, Y. M. C. A. leaders. One of the objectives of the recent four million dollar drive has been the erection of buildings to accommodate thirty missionary families home on furlough.

* * * *

The first two chapters of the official history of the University of Chicago describe with unedifying detail the patient steering by which the goldfish was finally landed. When news of the Rockefeller gift came to the Baptists gathered in national convention at Boston the entire assembly rose with the doxology on its lips and Dr. Henson exclaimed, "I scarcely dare trust myself to speak. I feel like Simeon when he said, 'Now, Lord, lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.'"[22]

The gift called for additional givers. To clinch the $600,000 a general collection of $400,000 was required. Appeals were sent to 1,200 Baptist pastors throughout the West. The second Sunday in April was made "University Day." "Preach the sermon if your salary is in arrears and finances lagging," was the *mot d'ordre.* "Contribute to the cause of Christian culture."

The promise dangled before the country churches was "a great Christian university" to counteract the materialism of the Middle West. The churches responded admirably. "Not only have the well-to-do given liberally, but those of lesser means, and even the poor out of their hard-won savings." Baptist people in Chicago subscribed $233,000, one church

Magazine, June 1923. "I hate stiff-necked doctrine just as cordially as do the rest of us who are under thirty. . . . We find ourselves curiously bold in our irreverence. . . . As one hoping to enter the ministry I should leave the church if I thought it would prove to be such a hopeless embalming institution," etc. Mr. Hunter, who has been six years in the Y. M. C. A. in the East and who praises Chinese students because of their apostolic zeal *for science,* speaks of our Lord as "one who met men eating and drinking, quick with redemption, exuberant with laughing humor, gesturing with immense great jollity as he made fun of the pious sticklers who strained at a gnat only to swallow a camel."

giving $80,000, another $50,000, another $20,000, and a fourth $7,000, and all the rest in proportion to ability.[23]

If they could have but looked forward to Foster and Case; to Dewey's philosophy and Watson's "Behaviourism";* to Loeb and Leopold!

Dr. Augustus H. Strong, who was influential in the promotion of the university for Christian ends, gives in some unpublished notes the impression of his first contacts with it. The buildings were being constructed on Sundays as well as on weekdays; in chapel during the summer of '93 the services were punctuated by the thunder of trunks of World Fair guests coming from and going to Sunday trains. At the Y. M. C. A. he heard Prof. Shorey explaining that "the Greeks had all that was important to religion and in fact that Socrates and Plato were in some respects in advance of Christ." Materialism early soaked into every nook and corner of the university. President Harper confessed this: "The problem of the university's religious life," he says, "weighed on me more heavily than any other connected with the office which I have been called to administer. I have noticed that with each recurring year it has required a greater effort on my part to undertake this kind of service [chapel talks]. I have asked myself whether as a matter of fact it was growing more and more difficult to deal with subjects of this kind in a university atmosphere."†

The Baptists of the West had their well-established theological seminary with a student body of 190 and assets amount-

*J. M. Aldrich writing in the *Christian Register*, 1922:251, says of Prof. Watson: "John Broadus Watson was from a strong Baptist family and a South Carolina college. I presume he kept his religion at least that far. Then he went to the University of Chicago and specialized in psychology, getting a doctor's degree and losing his religion somewhere on the way. In his book *Behavioristic Philosophy* he announced that he had found the term consciousness unnecessary. Well, it happened that his book was just nicely before the public when the papers carried the announcement that the trustees of Johns Hopkins university had accepted his resignation for cause. It is not a pleasant story."

†President Harper no doubt did his share in opening the dikes but he regretted the consequences all in apparent unconsciousness of what he had done.

ing to a half million, the Baptist Union Seminary at Morgan Park. Its president was Dr. Northrop, an able and devout theologian. Mr. E. Nelson Blake, who had secured its considerable endowment, was an evangelical Baptist and Bible teacher of sixty years standing.[24]

Unfortunately by the terms of the Rockefeller gift this seminary was incorporated into the university. "Mr. Rockefeller builded if not better, yet more broadly than he knew," is the Unitarian comment.[25] Precautions were indeed taken to ensure the denominational character of the university. Three-fifths of the trustees were to be Baptists and the title to the land on which the University is built, was to revert to the Baptist Education Society if this clause were violated. "In this particular this charter shall be forever unalterable."[26]

The trustees have remained Baptist but hardly the theologians, save in name. Prof. G. B. Foster while teaching in this Baptist seminary was pastor of the Unitarian church at Madison, Wisconsin.[27] Prof. Haydon* has succeeded him at

"It would be curious and something very sad," he wrote, "if the institutions founded by our fathers as training schools for Christian service should come to be centers of influence destructive to that same Christianity. The first purpose of the college was the defense of Christianity together with the education of men to foster its interests. No one will deny that this purpose has been most effectively realized during the past two centuries of church and college history.

"But what is the situation today? Is it true that there has been a remarkable decrease in the actual teaching of Christian truth while a large and growing emphasis has been placed upon the teaching of branches which are altogether devoid of religious character? Yes. Is it true that of the students who enter college only a meagre few look forward to Christian service of any kind, the larger number having as a matter of fact but the slightest interest in religious matters? Yes. Is it certainly a fact that many men and women who enter college as Christian workers in their home churches take little or no active part in church life after they have completed their college work? Yes.

"There has been a peculiar and a fatal lack of proper religious instruction for the young during the past twenty years and we are just beginning to feel its terrible effects."—*Religion and the Higher Life*, 132.

*At the annual meeting of the Western Conference [Unitarian], 1922, Prof. Haydon began his address by stating that he was a member of the Hyde Park Baptist church, pastor of the Madison Unitarian church and devoting his life to teaching the non-Christian religion of the future. C.R. 1922:601.

Madison while lecturing on comparative religion in the seminary. A third Baptist, Prof. Merrifield, occupies a chair in the New Testament and on Sundays is preacher in All Souls Unitarian church.[28] Prof. Soares, who is a favorite in Unitarian pulpits and Unitarian lecture courses, is quoted in the *Christian Register* as saying of himself, "Why should a person withdraw from his denomination? To withdraw means that his denomination means something to him when it does not."[29] "The organ of the seminary, *The Biblical World*," also remarks the *Christian Register*, "is as far from conformity to Baptist doctrines as the deliverances from Ford Hall."[30] The Unitarian seminary at Meadville, Pa., transfers its whole student body summer times to the University of Chicago and is to be merged with the Baptist divinity school as soon as the objections of certain Unitarians are overcome.[31] These circumstances naturally make the school useless for evangelical Christians and this is practically acknowledged in a signed statement of Dr. Burton and Dr. Padelford, president and secretary of the Northern Baptist Board of Education:

"The Divinity School of the University of Chicago is largely a graduate school. Only a small percentage of its students are preparing for the pastorates of our churches. *Moreover this school frankly and unequivocally represents only one group of churches in our denomination.* This group is large and important and must have a school for the adequate training of its ministry.

"On the other hand the great majority of our churches in the Middle West are of a conservative type and they need and have a right to an institution which shall train ministers for their churches. . . . We believe that if by some wise measures such an institution could be established, the denomination would stand back of it with men and money.

"Baptists will always need different types of schools because such a denomination as ours will always be composed, as it always has been, of people of different types of thought. . . . By our very constitution we cannot dictate the thinking of

our scholars and our teachers. We should cease to be Baptists if we did, but we must always insure that the great groups among us have adequate institutions for the thorough training of a ministry. The Board of Education hopes the denomination will give serious heed to this suggestion."[32]

In other words, their Middle West seminary having been, to all intents and purposes, Unitarianized, Baptists are officially urged to collect funds to establish a new one to take its place.

In 1921 a committee was appointed by the Northern Baptist Convention to examine into the religious conditions prevailing in schools founded and controlled by the denomination.* This would seem to be a legitimate procedure in view of current complaints regarding them, but the committee had to report that on every side they were characterized as "inquisitors."[33] The Unitarian organ was especially violent concerning these internal affairs of the Baptists. The heads of the schools, however, gave frank and cordial answers with the exception of President Faunce of Brown, who declared the inquiry "an attack both upon education and religion." "Never since the days of Roger Williams," he continued, "has so open an attempt been made to force under financial penalty the Baptists of the country to adopt a series of dogmas in writing."

The Divinity School of the University of Chicago defined itself as "the contribution of the Baptist denomination to the theological education of the country," rather than as a denominational institution, certainly an accurate confession. As to its general attitude toward the Christian faith it affirmed that

*"It was alleged that many of our young men and women brought up in Christian ways and full of Christian zeal have gone to college and at the completion of their course have returned home with their Christian faith impaired and their confidence in the Scriptures shattered; that many of the young men appearing before councils for examination with a view to ordination to the ministry have shown an utter lack of conviction concerning the very things they were to preach . . . that often the teachers in schools endowed by Baptist money, supported by Baptist influence and contributions, have shown scant respect for what has always been the rule of faith and practise among Baptist people."—*Annual of Northern Baptist Convention,* 1921, 40.

"we teach our students to study the Bible reverently. . . . We bring them directly to the Bible in order that with the guidance and help of the Holy Spirit they may experience its inspiration. . . . We teach our students to recognize and conserve the truth expressed in this historic document."[35]

A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion is a joint production of this divinity faculty and gives a fair measure wherewith to test its answer to the denomination on whose past self-denials it lives. One is struck with the lack of Christian insight displayed; at times, too, with the writers' hostility to the obvious. These men have no perceptible love for Christ. Their whole interest in him seems to be in the problems which he starts or may be made to start. Sometimes their theorizings are sheerly frivolous. Dean Mathews speaks about the "bourgeois social mind" as controlling the Christian interpretation of the past generation. "There resulted from the interplay of Christianity with this new spirit an emphasis on the atonement largely in commercial terms which was to have much the same influence in religion as the bourgeois movement has exercised in politics."[36] This theory belongs to the category of the καινότερον, indeed, but not of the true. No serious man would think of defending it. To J. M. Powis Smith we are indebted for this gem: "The Hebrews were never far removed from starvation. It may well be that this lack of things material contributed much toward the development of spiritual riches." Any way but by divine inspiration to account for Old Testament religion! "The Hebrews were given no extraordinary or abnormal aids or advantages not within the reach of other men then as now,"[37] is Prof. Smith's *ipse dixit*. The adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, and all the rest in Paul's list, were no aids to sanctity compared with short rations. Like intellectual *parvenus* generally these Chicago theologians ever choose that which is most paradoxical and furthest from tradition. It's a poor method for getting at truth.

It would be hard to find anything more supercilious than the attitude which Prof. Case assumes towards our Lord. In

his book, *The Millennial Hope,* he speaks of him as *"an impressive individual,"* and in another passage, "To this mighty Christ the angelic choir renders *fulsome praise,* ascribing to him honor and glory and eternal dominion."[38] Yet he grants that "Jesus' actual contribution to the rise of Christianity is really more significant than might at first appear," and then, adjusting his glasses, "There is much to prove that his life was one of rich spiritual attainments."

"Jesus," he tells us elsewhere, "is commonly regarded as the founder of the Christian movement." But one should be on one's guard against attributing too much to him. There was a "natural disposition to seek the authority of Jesus" for later developments. When baptism was made a feature of church life he was represented as having "accepted baptism by John." "The last meal which Jesus had eaten informally with the disciples now came to be viewed [falsely, of course] as the deliberate establishment of a Christian rite. . . . Similarly, after the leaders of the new movement rather tardily arrived at the conviction of a world-wide mission, they felt assured that Jesus himself had intended this result and had in fact commissioned them to make disciples of all nations."

Pauline Christianity made large drafts upon contemporary paganism. The resurrection of Jesus was but a reflection of similar myths related of pagan gods and heroes. The worship of Lord Serapis and Lady Isis gave the pattern for the deification of Jesus. The "simple recipe 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead thou shalt be saved' " echoes the formulas of pagan cults. "Our sources of information regarding Jesus are all interpretive in character" and "if we are to get at the picture of the historical Jesus which lies buried beneath this mass of accretion, we must use rigid critical processes."[39]

And so forth.

In a Religious Education Association address (R. E. 1910: 84) Dean Shailer Mathews told his fellow educationists, "The

theology of democracy has yet to be written. Whereas, Calvinists spoke of God's election of man, the democrat speaks of man's election of God. The democratic spirit of the age is demanding that the church abandon sovereignty as the controlling concept of its theology and leaven itself with democracy."[40] This shrill note and Lilliputian gesture appear in most of these liberal disquisitions.

Thus Prof. G. B. Smith, systematic theologian of Chicago University, tells us that "the phrase, the sovereignty of God, harks back to the days of belief in the divine right of kings. But today we believe in a democratic form of government which allows citizens to call rulers to account. If criticism is a valuable moral asset in our political life can we exclude it from religious thinking? May we not demand that God shall be required to receive the moral approval of men? This spirit of democracy with its insistance on the rights of men is responsible for the current protests against such ideas as . . . that he has a right to insist on some rigid plan of salvation purely because he has chosen this rather than any other plan."

The Bible has no authority for our day. It has ceased to be a lamp to our feet and a light to our path. "It has been assumed," says Prof. Smith, "that a study of the Bible would adequately prepare one to live a moral life." Nothing is further from the truth. "So long as we are pursuing the devious ways of attempting to solve modern moral problems by a study of precepts addressed to other times and other occasions, we shall reap the harvest of moral confusion."[41]

Redemption is, according to another of these Chicago *penseurs,* Prof. Soares, an obsolete fancy. "We no longer think of salvation as dependent upon the acceptance of certain redemptive facts."* The Bible is not to be thought of as "a

*Prof. Albion W. Small writes: "This is a vicarious world, but not as stupidly conceived by mediæval theologians, who located the one vicarious act of importance in the death on the cross. Life is vicarious in that its processes begin, continue, and end with exchanges of sacrifice wherever there are moral beings."—Quoted in ELLWOOD, *Reconstruction,* 178.

repository of redemptive facts." "The idea that the principal business of the church is to get people converted or committed to the Christian life," is properly branded. "As if anything significant were accomplished by this one moment of decision." Who would be so unenlightened as to think that the conversions of Paul and Augustine and Luther and Bunyan and Wilberforce had any meaning for human history. "The great Sunday-school world is getting away from the idea of evangelizing children"; and most significant of all "the great Student Movement throughout the world has given up the old appeal entirely." Prof. Soares thinks of revelation as self-deception. "The message which is 'received' is usually a body of ideas suggested to the mind by the current state of affairs. It is in other words a sub-conscious inference from situations." To this is "Thus spake the Lord" reduced in south Chicago.[42]

The Finality of the Christian Religion, by the late George B. Foster, can be considered as a sort of official pronouncement of the theology of this divinity school since it was issued in commemoration of the first decade of the university's existence. It is a book which would have warmed the bloodless heart of Voltaire. "An intelligent man who now affirms his faith in miracle can hardly know what intellectual honesty means." The hypothesis of God has become "superfluous in every science, even that of religion itself." The supernatural Christ is compared to Santa Claus. "Ontologically Santa Claus is unreal, but morally, so to speak, he is the most real being in the world, since he is the embodiment and personification of the most real and most worthy sentiments and services of the human heart. Similarly the Messianic idea stood for realities which supplied the dynamic for a people's whole career."

"Jesus did not transcend the limits of the purely human. He did not put himself alongside the Almighty God. He never thought of ascribing a pre-mundane existence to himself: nor did he claim to be judge of the world." It is doubtful if he ever "called himself the Son of man."

Foster speaks of the "wooden conception of his abstract sinlessness." "Jesus confronts us as knowing what sin was, knowing too not from divine omniscience. . . . The idea of the absolute sinlessness of Jesus is no result of historical study. It is simply sanctimonious superficiality to spirit away his words, 'Why callest thou me good?'" "He did not consider his own nature to be different in essence from that of other men."

The New Testament story of supernatural birth, miracle, resurrection, is "an antiquated affair, a relic that is worthless *to the cultivated classes.*" [Prof. Foster was a West Virginian poor white living by collecting ginseng before he became a Chicago pundit.] "Christological dogmas really signify for many children of our time a sarcophagus of the personality of Jesus. . . . One flees from it as from a ghost. . . . Historical science must repudiate the entire supernaturalist position" in the matter of the resurrection of Christ. The task of historical science is "to blast and tunnel through the solidified Pauline construction to the real Jesus of Nazareth." But "not only in primitive Christianity, but even in the words and ideas of Jesus there is a plus which does not belong to the eternal and essential gospel. . . . To erect independently of experience the sayings of Jesus as such into a norm of life for every time and place is *immoral.*"

"The picture which Jesus inherited of the world and its processes is gone forever. We cannot entice it from the Dead Sea of the past and we would not if we could. . . . We have at length learned that to have faith does not mean to hold a set of opinions; does not even mean to think what Jesus thought."

"Jesus knew nothing of many of the moral and social tasks which today we cannot escape. He had a view of the world which made him indifferent to the great historical future of society." He was in other words a provincial with all sorts of limitations, "a child of his time, a merely human Christ who does no more and no less than interpret to us the eternal

revelation of God in human nature." To this shrivels the Lord Jesus Christ whom Foster impertinently describes as "this superhuman entity with his epiphany and his performances."

All of which is the stalest Unitarianism.*[43]

Prof. E. S. Ames is pastor of the Hyde Park church of the Disciples as well as professor. His utterances are of the same type, but expressed in psychological phrasing. The traditional God is an impossible concept. "No such static, transcendent, non-empirical reality is conceivable *by us,*" i. e., by the "leaders of modern thought."

"In a despotic society, where sovereignty is idealized, to think of God means to humble one's self, to take on the posture and employ the phrases which a menial uses in the presence of his lord. . . . But where the idea of God is the embodiment of ideals arising from democratic social movements, its presence in the mind expresses itself in motor reactions indicative of respect for the welfare of all members of society."

When we pray, we are really praying to a secondary personality within the recesses of our human being. "Prayer is a natural expression of the social character of all consciousness. . . . The conscious life of the individual is largely an interplay between the different selves of his different attitudes and habits. These argue, confer, advise, and contend, with each other, quite as actual people do. These selves may be exalted moral beings with which the lesser selves of one's actual temper and deeds seek communion and from which they petition aid of every kind.

*It was of this book that a Chicago daily wrote: "We are struck also with the hypocrisy and treachery of these attacks on Christianity. This is a free country and a free age and men can say what they choose about religion but this is not what we arraign these divinity professors for. Is there no place in which to assail Christianity but a divinity school? Is there no one to write infidel books except the professors of Christian theology? Is a theological seminary an appropriate place for a general massacre of Christian doctrines? . . . We are not championing either Christianity or infidelity, but only condemning infidels masquerading as men of God and Christian teachers."—Quoted in HORSCH, *Modern Religious Liberalism,* 276.

"One particular type of self often becomes the standard for the individual and this self is largely or solely formed upon the model of some definite historical or imaginary character. Where this is true, prayer may attain all the vividness of personal communion, even including hallucinations and visions in which the ideal personality speaks to one or intervenes in one's behalf."

If theism evanesces into mere egotheism, all the phenomena of Christian experience will naturally be explained as psychic reaction. So Prof. Ames tells us that "hysteria and other nervous and circulatory disorders are common causes" of the sense of sin. "The methods and many conversions of revivals are essentially the methods and effects of hypnotism." The Spirit of God does not mould and appeal to human hearts. There is no Spirit of God as commonly understood. "In a certain sense the religious life is an irradiation of the reproductive instinct." Conversion is a phase of adolesence. "One of the most significant and best established facts which the new science of psychology of religion has discovered is that conversion belongs primarily to the years between ten and twenty-five." "The expression, 'The word of the Lord came unto me,' represents experience common to automatism, trances, etc., in primitive religions. Paul was probably a neurotic; Augustine a sensualist with a highly developed nervous temperament. It is apparent that there were very special individual reasons for their dramatic conversions."[44]

The physicists, the astronomers, the biologists, are making discoveries. The liberal theologians must not drop behind. So we have the "new science of the psychology of religion." Prof. Sylvanus Thompson remarks of a psychologist of vogue, "The new psychologists, of whom we have in William James the most shining example, tickle our ears with the jargon in which they dress up half-ascertained, half-known facts on the borders of our consciousness and manufacture an exact science out of the very elements of inexactness." I wonder what he would say of Professors Coe, Ames, and Starbuck.

Prof. H. L. Willett is in the divinity school of the Disciples affiliated to Chicago University. He holds to the conventional opinions and to quote him would be but to repeat. "Every miracle and every prophecy could be eliminated from the Scripture and its supreme values would not be disturbed," he writes in "Our Bible." Our Lord expounded to the two on the Emmaus road in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. But he was mistaken in his fancies. "There is not," says Prof. Willett, "an instance in the New Testament of any such incident in the life of Jesus that holds to any Old Testament passage the relation of fulfilment to prediction." Prof. Willett holds low views of the Decalogue. In "The Moral Leaders of Israel" he tells us that "the first commandment inculcates the intolerance of Jehovah which is characteristic of the Hebrew religion." Novel interpretations are worked out. The still, small voice is not that of the Spirit of God. "Wind, earthquake and fire—spasmodic violence—should give way to *a quiet planning.* The new way to dispose of Baalism is a series of well-laid and executed plots."[45]

The lofty, patronizing note is heard in Prof. Goodspeed's *Story of the New Testament.* "Though Christians in increasing numbers may no longer attach to it [the New Testament] the dogmatic values of the past, they will never cease to prize it for its inspiring and purifying power and for its simple and moving story of the ministry of Jesus." The Gospel of Matthew was written by a Jewish Christian who preferred to remain unknown, not by the apostle; First Peter by a Christian elder of Rome, it is not possible otherwise to say whom; John by that elder of Ephesus who wrote the three letters, not by the apostle, and so on. The modes on the current fashion plates are strictly followed in Chicago.*[46]

*The University of Chicago seminary is preparing a foreign export business in these ideas. With the Chicago Congregational seminary, now closely attached to it, it *"is building up a School of Missions second to none in the country.* It is significant that over sixty missionaries and their wives have been in residence during all or part of the current year. *Especially attractive are these courses to students planning to*

Such is the teaching which the theologians of the University of Chicago seek to inject into the churches. As it becomes clearer what they are up to, opposition increases. The Rev. A. W. Wishart, trained in this seminary, declared at a Religious Education Convention, "If all the seminaries were suddenly to become thoroughly modern in spirit and teaching, most of their graduates would find themselves without charges. In all probability, organized opposition to the seminaries would arise and new seminaries would be established to supply the churches with the kind of ministers they desired. . . . *We need more advanced ministers with religious fervor and broad training who will lovingly, but firmly, brave opposition of the misguided masses in the struggle to promote true religion among men.*"[47]

The pigs must be driven into the right pens.

But suppose the churches prove incorrigible? One way would be to insist by law that the ministers receive the right kind of training. The Rev. Allan Hoben, a former member of the Chicago divinity faculty and now president of the Baptist college at Kalamazoo, makes a suggestion of this sort. There are too many graduates from those dreadful Bible institutes in the ministry. "Public opinion, which is becoming increasingly sensitive to the inutility and costliness of a ministry overcrowded by those who are unfit and therefore obstructive to a united community effort for good, will demand, *perhaps by law,* a more adequate education for the professional religious teacher. . . . *The assumption of a social task as a life-calling must not be the presumption of ignorance or weak sentimentality, but the rational service of an enlightened and trained mind.*

"If from the viewpoint of democracy the church is a public utility, collecting large sums of money and aiming to render

devote their lives to educational missions." (Chicago Theological Seminary Register, 13, 26.) It has (as Union and Harvard) devised "elaborate plans for drawing into its enrolment choice students from all parts of the earth."—KELLY, *Theological Seminaries in America,* 104.

services from which the state deliberately refrains, has the state the right to demand anything by way of standardization or efficiency of those services and to expect a wise and reasonable use of the money solicited from the citizens?"*[48] Obviously, yes! Fair play to givers has ever been the historical enthusiasm of these Chicago University divines.

The first $7,500 for their divinity school was collected by Nathaniel Colver, a powerful Puritan figure, who because of lack of early opportunity used to describe himself as "a graduate of the brush-heap." Before teaching at the seminary, he organized training classes for prospective ministers in his own home, and among his students were D. L. Moody and H. C. Mabie.

*This book is a University of Chicago publication in religious education "to be used by thoughtful parents and in midweek meetings." Dr. Hoben believes that the prevention of sins "is more important than their forgiveness and that prevention is in a very large measure possible," 141. Well-done work by a child in poultry raising, etc., presents "a way of expressing his obedience to God in terms which are for him perhaps more suitable than public prayer." The Benedictines with their *laborare est orare* have nothing on the president of Kalamazoo College. Of children's gardens he says: "Probably there is no more satisfactory and timely religious exercise for the child of this age than to co-operate with God in producing the food that is necessary to life," 39. On page 116 he suggests that there should be a program of better social diversion *"to redeem the dance."* The president of Kalamazoo stands shoulder to shoulder with the emerited president of Harvard who closes an essay on the Wise Direction of Church Activities with the super-wise remark, "I was once asked if there was any study which I should be willing to have required of every student in Harvard College. After a moment's reflection I said I thought there was one, dancing."

"Here is one of the most serious things. We are letting into the Baptist ministry a very large percentage of men who have no ability to discriminate between science and literature," says one of the denominational shepherds, Dr. Shailer Mathews, to the assembled theologians at Rochester Seminary. The churches must be taught to select the approved brand. At the same conference Dr. Padelford complained that in two training schools in Chicago last year there were 151 Baptist men preparing for the ministry, more than the total student body of Colgate, Rochester, and Berkeley combined. These scabs must learn their place. *"Some drastic action may be necessary before this condition can be cured.* If we would set up a definite standard of admittance to our ministry and require men to secure a thorough training before they could be ordained we should reduce the over-supply and eliminate many unqualified men; we should create a healthier attitude in the churches towards the ministry."—*Rochester Theological Bulletin,* 68th year, No. 1, 42 and 53.

His ministerial institutes in the Middle West were famous. Dr. Clough modelled similar ones for the Telegus upon Colvin's lines. Work at Richmond, Va., for education of negro ministers filled his last years with usefulness.[49]

But Colvin would have received scant tolerance from the theologians who now dominate the school he founded. Indeed, the educational machine of the denomination is moving in a way to weed out such men and to give Baptists a theological closed-shop. A two years course of study is proposed for all candidates for ordination. State conventions are asked to pass resolutions refusing financial aid to churches which shall not in the future conform to these educational standards. Ministerial passports are to be required for those moving from one Association to another. There are to be committees appointed, in each state convention, on ministerial standing to make inquisition as to the educational status of ministers. Ministers who have failed to comply with minimum requirements for ordination are to be refused aid from ministers and missionary benefit funds.[50]

The full import of this scheme is obvious in the recommendation that state conventions avail themselves of seminary help in preparing and directing pre-ordination courses of study for those who have not had seminary training. The nature of this training can be fairly judged from the reading courses which these seminaries have drawn up for ministers.

Ten years ago Newton Theological Institution published one such in its official bulletin [Vol. 6, No. 2, Feb. 1914] "for Newton students and alumni and Baptist ministers generally" with the expressed "hope that these recommendations will lead to wider and more intelligent reading and will add many permanently valuable books to pastors' libraries." This list is a sort of theological toxicology; also an appropriate comment on the trustees' insistence that it is "immoral" to question the evangelical loyalty of the teaching in Newton seminary. Toy, Driver, Moore, Peake, Sabatier, Duhm, C. F. Kent's *Historical Bible,* are all commended—Kent's *Life and Teach-*

ings of Jesus as "the best brief exposition of the more liberal view." Then there is Fowler's *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel* ["exceedingly fascinating"], O. Holtzmann and Bousset ["very suggestive"], the *Philosophy of Religion* of the Danish free-thinker Harald Höffding ["valuable"], the *Psychology of Religion* by the free-thinker Starbuck ["in the study of conversion experience, this book stands unrivalled"], the works of the atheist Leuba, Ames' *Psychology of Religious Experience* ["an illuminating and scholarly work"], the works of G. A. Coe ["all his books repay careful reading"], Pratt's *Psychology of Religious Belief.* Hinckley Mitchell and G. A. Gilbert, both tipped out of seminaries as theologically impossible, find favor in the Newton book list.*

The Rochester Theological Seminary prints its list also [*R. T. S. Bulletin,* 73rd year, No. 1]. With most of the

*The Newton faculty recommends to Baptists the book which caused the departure of Prof. Gilbert from the Congregational seminary in Chicago. "Almost everything in the narrative of the birth and infancy of Jesus, the resurrection and various of the narratives of the ministry are relegated to the realm of legend." Yet after his dismissal Prof. Gilbert was chosen to lead the New Testament courses in the *Biblical World* of the University of Chicago and his offending book receives Newton's commendation. C.R. 1912:1070 and 1913:38.

Of *The Man of Nazareth* by Prof. F. L. Anderson of Newton the *Christian Register* says, "If a Trinitarian wrote these chapters the most critical Unitarian will not discover it. Even the chapter on the finality of Jesus . . . contains nothing which the readers of the *Christian Register* would not call perfectly good Unitarianism." 1913:87.

What valuation of the Lord Jesus Christ do the following banal sentences suggest? "Jesus seems not to have had the slightest trace of our modern neurasthenia," 190. "Jesus knew God as well as he knew his mother," 169. Of the double nature of Christ Dr. Anderson says: "This Jesus, now God, now man, is thus alien to us and we instinctively feel that he cannot truly sympathize with us in our temptations, struggles, and sorrows. . . . This dictum of fourth century theologians cannot be made binding on free Protestant Christians and is entirely out of tune with modern feeling and conceptions."

These are the tactics which Methodist modernists also are using. The obligatory study course prescribed for Methodist ministers has been their point of attack. A thousand men take this annually and nearly 750 are graduated from it into the pulpits of Methodism, many more than all the Methodist seminaries together send out each year. "If the rationalist element can control these courses," writes Dr. Harold Paul Sloan, "they will quickly control the preaching emphasis of Methodism and practically destroy the church's doctrinal foundation."

Newton favorites, one gets in addition Troeltsch, G. B. Foster [excluded from the Chicago Baptist ministers' association for his anti-Christianity], Diepenbring, K. Lake, Wernle, Morgan. Of the free-thinker H. G. Wells' *Outline of History,* this bulletin says, "Its tremendous suggestiveness makes it indispensable to the modern minister." Case's *Millennial Hope* "will prove of great value." A special list by Prof. Moehlmann commends the *History of New Testament Criticism* by the free-thinker Conybeare, and *What Jesus Taught* by Prof. Slaten, of whose crypto-Unitarian mole-work we have spoken.

The selection of books is in the hands of a commission appointed by the Methodist board of education. Of this commission Prof. H. F. Rall is described as the leading spirit. ["Dr. Rall has been the high-priest of the course of study which has given conservative Methodists so much concern. He is a very skilful gentleman and enjoys the right of way with the Methodist Book Concern and the church official papers so as to publish everything he wants to favorable to the new theology propaganda."—Dr. Ridout in *Pentecostal Herald,* June 22, 1921.] The books chosen have been chiefly of the ephemeral "modern" sort—Elwood, Soares, Rauschenbusch, Faunce, Hyde, Rall, McGiffert, W. N. Clarke, Betts, Meyer, Weigle, Coe, Athearn, E. C. Hayes, Gladden, W. Walker.

The general Conference of 1920 adopted Dr. Sloan's resolution requiring that "only such books as are in full and hearty accord with these doctrines and that outline of faith established in the constitution of the church . . . shall be included in the conference course." Certain of these books have been withdrawn; others remain in violation of the express decree of the General Conference. When Dr. Sloan made his statement regarding the course of study all the Methodist papers except the *Methodist Review* refused to print it and *Zion's Herald,* so Dr. Sloan tells us, while attacking the writer, declined to publish the criticism which was the subject of the attack. There is no doubt where the official machine stands.—Sloan, *The New Infidelity,* 24.

Protests have come to the bishops from conferences in many parts of the country. They complain of a study course for preachers, class-leaders, and deaconesses with no history of Methodism, no book on Scripture interpretation, no book on the discipline; which omits Wesley's sermons altogether and which chiefly stresses the fad literature of the day in sociology and pedagogy. Some petition the bishops to resume control of the course.

"What our church wants to know," writes one keen Methodist leader, "is whether our deaconesses through these new studies will know how to find in Isaiah the right chapter to read and to explain to a dying woman with an unbelieving husband and heart-broken children at her bedside, rather than to discuss whether there were one, two, or three Isaiahs."

But the arid doctrinaires of modernism never think of such situations.

The trivial little book of W. N. Clarke, *Sixty Years with the Bible,* receives extravagant praise in Prof. Parsons' list.

These are the seminaries whose greedy hands were stretched out to take $800,000 (Newton) and $500,000 (Rochester) from the self-denial and missionary zeal of Baptists in the years 1919-24.*

Rochester Theological Seminary was built up into a powerful and useful institution by Dr. Augustus H. Strong, backed by a group of laymen, Messrs. Trevor, Milbank, Hoyt, and the elder Rockefeller. For many years it provided the Baptist churches with loyal pastors and missionaries. But a change has come over its teaching. In his unpublished autobiography, Dr. Strong lays this at the door of Prof. George Cross. "The result of the election of Dr. Cross," he says, "has been the resignation of some members of the committee and the withdrawal of others from active service. I regard that election as the greatest calamity that has come to the seminary. It was the entrance of an agnostic, skeptical, and anti-Christian element into its teaching, the results of which will be only evil. The election of Dr. Cross was followed by that of Professors Robins, Parsons, and Nixon, who sympathized with these views. These men, with Prof. Moehlmann, soon gave evidence in their utterances that a veritable revolution had taken place in the attitude of the seminary towards the fundamentals of the Christian faith."†

*So in the *Newton Bulletin,* Vol. 8, No. 4, p. 4: "We need $100,000 to endow a department of religious education. Its services in our churches should be the contribution of the seminary to the work of raising the standard of Sunday school instruction in our New England churches. The work of such a man would be of inestimable value to our churches." The productive assets of Newton are about one million; of Rochester nearly two. Newton receives a yearly grant of $10,000 from the Northern Baptist Convention.

†The Rev. Russell Brougher, graduated from Rochester in the class of 1922, told how he had been officially called to account for giving to outsiders points as to the teaching of the seminary. "In the course of this reproof the statement was made that Rochester Seminary was in a war and that to give out facts to those upon the other side was in the nature of spying. Here is indeed a startling situation when a school of the Christian church feels called upon to keep its teachings

That Dr. Strong has not overstated the facts, is clear enough from a casual reference to Prof. Cross's *Creative Christianity* [delivered at Yale on the N. W. Taylor Foundation!] Dr. Cross has the reverence for the "young college people" which liberal theologians often exhibit. "We must make up our minds that their interpretation of the Christian faith, as of life in general, will be very different from that which was given to us by the Fathers." Does he have as great confidence in the sayings of our Lord? Hardly. "If all the teachings of Jesus were brought together in the exact form in which he gave them there might be found among them some that would not commend themselves as fixed and final to the faith of the most intelligent and devout Christians of the present day. *Men cannot be called upon to believe things simply because of the name that is attached to them.*"

The great assumption of modernism runs through this book. "Every one so trained [i. e., scientifically] must place a note of interrogation after all the biblical accounts of miracles." "The scientifically trained college man of today" distinctly disallows the existence of miracles. This "youth of scientific training" would class the miracles of Christ "with the folklore, legends, or mythology he had already found in the traditions of other religious faiths."

But why limit this enlightenment to the youth of American colleges? M. Perrot, French mission teacher in Madagascar, has described the convulsions of laughter into which savages of the island went when he described to them the resurrection of Christ. There are naked modernists as well as modernists in shorts and sweaters.

The picture of Jesus which the New Testament gives us is not actual. It is rather the impression made on his *milieu* modified by the traditions and fancies of that *milieu*. The regard of Christ's following "was not the wondering admiration

secret and when a student is charged with unfair conduct for making them public."—H. P. SLOAN, *The New Infidelity and the New Reformation*, 10.

of some abstractly perfect character, such as recluses of old or sentimentalists of our time might dream of. Nor was it sublime approval of the sentiments he was said to be continually expressing. This would mean little more than to say that *he pleased them because he was so much like themselves, as they pictured themselves at their best.*"

"Christ is presented [by the historic theology] as an eternal divine personality whose abode is in a different realm from ours and whose higher nature is an inscrutable mystery to us. His appropriation to himself of an impersonal human nature was in order that in it this divine person whose nature is impassible might suffer redemptively for men. His whole career is interpreted as furnishing evidence that it was so and his death was an event of an order that pertained exclusively to himself. . . . How artificial this entire construction seems to us now. How we miss the humanness of Jesus as he sought to fulfil the imperative of his own self-legislative potencies and felt his way to perfection as we must do. . . . We are left in ourselves without the crown of personality when we are made solely beneficiaries of his atonement."

The plan of salvation is then a factitious futility. There is nothing to be saved from or saved to. "The attempts to bring the lives of men in this world under control by appealing to the definitely known results in the after life have lost their force in a large measure and in the more intelligent circles this kind of appeal is seldom resorted to." "The native sphere of the operation of the Christian spirit is in the forms of the community life native to humanity. *There we find our better world in making, and if we find it not there we find it nowhere.*"

There is no real distinction between "the saved" and "the unsaved." Nor is it even necessary that there be any organization whatsoever of the Christian communion as a separate institution. In the natural institutions of men are to be found "the moulds in which this higher spiritual force is to find its most effective mode of action. . . . These are to become the

organs of the higher life and they are to have the character which the church has been in the habit of claiming for itself."

So then, the Church against which the gates of hell shall not prevail is a superfluous thing, and it is through constitutions and political parties, soviets, and Tammany Hall, and trades-unions, that the Kingdom of God is to come. Why, then, does this church-salaried and long-vacationed theological professor not abandon his church position and attach himself to those "moulds of spiritual life," which are so much more to his liking?[51]

Another Rochester Seminary professor, Dr. W. Rauschenbusch, delivered the N. W. Taylor lectures in 1917. Prof. Rauschenbusch spoke sympathetically of "the blessed skepticism of the Age of Enlightenment," and his own skepticism often bears the eighteenth century stamp. Calvary has no unique significance. "What the death of Jesus now does for us, the death of the prophets did for him. None of the later theories of atonement are taught or even touched on in the sayings of Jesus except perhaps the Lord's Supper." He apparently regrets Christ's death as untimely and premature. "In thirty years of additional life, Jesus could have put the imprint of his mind much more clearly on the movement of Christianity and protected it from the profound distortions to which it was subjected," i. e., by Paul and the other apostles.

Nor has the communion any importance in the Christian life. "It is a question whether Jesus' thought ran beyond the group of his friends when he asked for a repetition of the meal," as if our Lord never anticipated world-wide discipleship. "The personality of Jesus was an achievement, not an effortless inheritance. . . . The inclination early set in to eliminate the element of temptation, of effort, of vigorous action and reaction, and to show him calm, majestic, omniscient, the effortless master of all forces. In all other cases, we judge the ethical worth of a man by the character he achieves by will and effort. If he has any unusual outfit of nature, we deduct it in our estimate.

How can we claim high ethical value for the personality and character of Jesus if no effort of will was necessary to achieve it?"

"We must democratize the conception of God," pipes our "social" theologian in the chorus of pygmy professors. *"The worst thing that could happen to God would be to remain an autocrat while the world is moving toward democracy. He would be dethroned with the rest."*

Actually, the man patronizes God. "Some would be willing to think of God as less than omnipotent and omniscient if only he were working hard with us for that Kingdom which is the only true democracy."

There is a Voltairean sneer in such a sentence as "faith may shrivel up into something so small as putting a finger on a Scripture text and 'claiming the promise,'" and contemptuous allusions to the mentality of Biblical believers are found here as in all literature of this type. Thus of those who look for the return of Christ, he says, "Eschatology is usually loved in inverse proportion to the square of the mental diameter of those who do the loving."[52]

Well, Sir Isaac Newton was profoundly interested in eschatology and the most presumptuous theologian has never found fault with his mentality.

At the Quarter Centennial Celebration of the University of Chicago, Dean Shailer Mathews stated of the graduates of his seminary that they were to be found "not only in significant pulpits of the country, but also in scores of faculties of theological seminaries and colleges as well as in the presidencies of colleges and as executive officers of various denominations."*[53]

*It is no secret that the University of Chicago theology is permeating the Baptist colleges and secondary schools and indeed it is obvious that this is the purpose of its sponsors. In *Modernism in Action* E. P. Stead gives a picture of Pillsbury Academy, a Minnesota school into which the denomination has put large sums and which is asking for four hundred thousand more. The unbelief which has worked into the school-faculty and the pulpit of the town-church would gratify the most ardent Unitarian if we may trust this pamphlet. Equally significant are the reports of moral degeneracy. "Teachers and students

Rochester Seminary is a case in point. Of its faculty, Cross, Robins, Parsons, Moehlmann, Erb, Vichert, have had Chicago training. They show it. One has but to turn to the *R. T. S. Bulletin* where they are discussing *entre nous*. Take No. 3, 73rd year, for example. Prof. Moehlmann takes large space to show *à la* Reuss the numerous contradictions of Scripture. Prof. Cross ridicules the Christian notion that there is any innate hostility between Christ and the world. "The religion that taught that the natural world was under a curse, that the good man was but a stranger here, and the only hope of humanity lay in the discovery or disclosure of another world to which men might flee and escape the tasks and trials of this world [is] directly controverted by the Protestant principle. . . . The world and the human mind [are] friends. . . . The facts and forces of the universe are working in sympathy with the Christian spirit." Prof. Robins, after a discussion of magic, tabu, etc., remarks, "Our own religion roots in exactly this soil, and the sacred book which preserves to us as Christians the records and traditions of our faith was initiated under exactly such circumstances." [*R. T. S. Bulletin,* 75th year, No. 1.] The Israelites owed much to the Canaanites. ("That the experience of contact with superior culture, and such that of the Canaanite and Philistines was, should quicken the life of the conquerors of Palestine is not surprising.") This member of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Board appears to have the Chicago theory of "democratizing God." "Time was when the conception of God as the universal monarch met all requirements, for monarchy supplied the pattern of the state to which the religious thinker subscribed. But now that he

swearing and smoking together in a downtown bowling alley; lying boosting of the school in prospectuses; Pillsbury Pool and Poker Club; petty thieving; the single Pillsbury ministerial student a cigarette fiend and snoose-chewer. A divinity student of the University of Chicago fills the village pulpit. He thinks Christ divine as we all are divine [snoose-chewers included] and that the Virgin Birth is a matter of opinion; agrees to avoid preaching negations but must stand by his [Chicago] divinity school as he has received a very wonderful training there."

has reached quite another conception of the state what shall we do with the controlling notion of God as monarch?"

"The theological seminaries of almost all our denominations are becoming so infected with this grievous error that they are not so much organs of Christ as organs of Antichrist," said Dr. A. H. Strong shortly before his death.[54] There is no reason to suppose that he would have excepted his own Rochester.

Or Colgate, if Prof. Frank A. Starratt of the chair of Christian theology is representative of that faculty. In the congenial atmosphere of the Religious Education Association convention (1918), Prof. Starratt, after speaking of the democratization of knowledge announced:

"Through this process, there has come about *the renunciation of all dependence upon some supra-human world for the solution of life's problems,* a recognition of the fact that man must rely upon his own powers to meet life's perplexities and also the insight that the individual does not stand alone in isolation, but in a social complex through which there is constant intercommunication and in which he finds correction as well as support and confirmation. This is the very essence of democracy *which looks not beyond the sphere of human experience for light and authority, but within.* Autocracy, on the other hand, rests ultimately upon *the belief that light and authority have their origin outside human experience* and reach man only through specially prepared channels.

"This would not foreclose the question as to whether man stands related to an extra-human spiritual world or not. That question might be answered either way, so far as the principle of democracy is concerned. It would preclude, however, every notion of special privilege or of an esoteric body of knowledge coming to man through special channels. If there be such a world open to man, it is open to man as man. If there be contacts with that world, then it will be discovered where all other contacts are discovered, in the conscious experience."[55]

Dr. Padelford likes to tell the story of "the little group of men at Hamilton who laid their thirteen dollars upon the table at Deacon Olmstead's and thus began the work of that Baptist seminary." But what is Dr. Padelford doing in his influential position as secretary of the Board of Education of the Northern Baptist Convention to prevent such essential atheism as the above being taught in the seminary which has grown out of that meeting at Hamilton?[56]

The Unitarians are following the apostasy of the Protestant seminaries with delighted expectancy, and when their organ says, "The progressive, liberal elements absolutely control Crozer,"[57] we can well believe Crozer to be far gone. Here, too, the University of Chicago influence is obvious. Profs. Matthews, Lewis, Norton, Cole, and Webster, bear the stamp of study there, Norton and Matthews having also taught in Chicago. In reviewing a book of Prof. Vedder, the *Christian Register* declared: "The church truly is awakening when it is possible for a teacher of church history to declare explicitly *against the old doctrine of the atonement.*"[58]

That was written eleven years ago and Prof. Vedder still holds a chair in Crozer.

Passages in this book, *The Fundamentals of Christianity,* might well have dropped from any "infidel" press. What would Dr. H. G. Weston and Mr. Samuel Crozer, who worked so intimately to build up this institution, have said to the following?

"Paul's idea of law, of penalty, of expiation, offends the modern sense of justice and contradicts our ethical values at every point of contact. Without caricature it may be compared to ideas that prevail in certain police circles today. A sensational crime is committed; the public is greatly aroused and demands detection and punishment of the criminal. This the police are unable to accomplish, but obviously something must be done to silence public clamor; so they 'frame up' a case against someone who can plausibly be made the scapegoat. He is convicted by perjury, the public cry is silenced, the majesty of the law has

been vindicated, justice is satisfied. But we are no longer content with that brand of 'justice.' We insist that the guilt of the guilty cannot be expiated, justice cannot be satisfied by the punishment of the innocent. Yet our theology continues to teach that the Almighty could find no better expedient to save men than 'to frame up' a case against His own Son and put to death the innocent for the guilty. And that which fills us with horror when done by man to man, we praise and glorify when done by God to God.[59] . . . *Paul appeals to a state of mind that has forever passed away*—at least among civilized peoples—though his theology may be still helpful to African savages."

Prof. Norton's *Rise of Christianity* is described by the Unitarian reviewer as "a remarkable illustration of how far modern scholarship has traveled *from the old supernatural toward the new natural explanation* of the rise of Christianity."[60] Dr. Frank Lewis writes [*Homiletical Review,* Feb. 1922], "We understand as our Baptist forefathers had not yet occasion to see that *the Bible is not now and has not been in the past, an authority in any real sense of the term.*" Naturally, then, the old biblical sanctions which found expression in Puritan Christianity are no longer valid. The Crozer professor of religious education, Prof. Stewart Cole, declares that "Puritanism has lost its reputation as a humanizing agent for building men of moral force capable of moral leadership. So far as the rank and file of young people are concerned, not only have the old values of conduct crumbled, but the authoritative social attitude of Puritanism has collapsed."

This from a Chicago University-trained professor of religious education when the Loeb-Leopold murder is still fresh in our memories!

Instead of Christ's categorical imperative, "Ye must be born again," we get the following vague jargon:

"Youth have not lost religion; they have turned from the program of Puritanism to a quest for wholesome life relations within their thrilling and social cosmic world. They are as

religious as ever, only their religion is of another color and quality. The dynamic of such a religious interpretation based on free moral inquiry into the social and cosmic facts of life and spontaneous and wholesome response to the stimuli arising out of the world in which they are searching, affords a religious control which they will be glad to employ for more beneficial investment of life."[61]

Another professor of religious education, Dr. James B. Webster, erstwhile of Shanghai Baptist College, now of Crozer, writes in the "social" *patois* of Shailer Mathews [*Christian Education and the National Consciousness in China*]. The principles of the Kingdom are those of a "social democracy in which the individual *realizes his best self* in advancing the welfare of humanity as a whole." The agency is "education"; "the outcome is no violation of the spirit of Jesus to call 'the democracy of God.'"

Old methods of missions are in Dr. Webster's judgment "strongly colored by the egoism and small group interests of the times in which they rose." Think of charging Judson and the pioneers of the American Board with egoism! Those who regard Christianity as "antagonistic to the ethnic faiths of the world" are unfavorably contrasted with those who consider it "the complement of other religions." We are told that it is a "*vicious* use of [mission] schools simply to teach Christian doctrine." The task of Christian education Dr. Webster defines as not the bringing of new moral and religious truths to China, but "the vitalizing of moral and religious truths which the Chinese possess. . . . It does not seem possible or necessary to bring any new moral truth to the Chinese."[62]

Crozer carries on an extension course which has furnished training to a thousand students including a number of missionaries in India, Africa, and Latin America. It has two scholarships for Asiatic Christian students bringing in $300 each yearly.

Chicago Theological Seminary is Congregationalist. It has recently affiliated with the University of Chicago. "The renewed

life of Andover at Cambridge," wrote President Davis in the *Chicago Theological Register,* "is the strongest possible argument for university affiliation." "Chicago Seminary," he continued, "will maintain its strongly evangelical and evangelistic temper at the University." The same fanfare was sounded, as we have seen, when Andover was to all intents and purposes turned over to the tender mercies of Harvard Unitarianism.

This seminary was built up in the pioneer days by the Congregational churches of the Middle West. Its teaching chairs, the Illinois, the Iowa, and the Michigan, professorships, bear witness in their names to the devotion and sacrifices of the frontier churches of these several states. Dr. Pearson gave $400,000 to this seminary, and Dr. Pearson was an evangelical who delighted in Bible teaching in railroad missions. In the Charter and Constitution of the school (p. 9) there is a declaration of faith in eleven articles. The third reads:

"I believe that God made all things by the word of His power and that in His righteous providence He overrules them in subservience to His own glory and the highest good of the universe."

How this seminary keeps faith with the ideals of its founders and particularly with this article of its constitution appears from Prof. C. A. Beckwith's *The Idea of God.* Prof. Beckwith is Illinois Professor of Christian Theology. He thinks that "the traditional idea of God was the product of conditions of the time." Naturally, therefore, it makes little appeal "to the modern man." *"If the alternative is either that idea of God unmodified or none, then the conclusion must be,—no God."*

"We cannot without further ado find in the Scriptures our final idea of God." Even Jesus does not furnish this. "No idea of God which arises under historical conditions is permanently valid for the rational and religious consciousness."

Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. Not so, thinks Prof. Beckwith.

Greek paganism knew better. "In the nature of the world as we know it, there is not a single thing which argues for an absolute beginning of its existence. The ultimate constituents of being are eternal."

There was no creation nor is there an Absolute God who created the world and who exists apart from it. "The ultimate question is perhaps not so much whether a Being so defined is personal, as whether such a Being exists."

"There is no such reality as an undifferentiated universal. The One exists only in and through the Many" [i. e., Mankind]. "So far as the ends are concerned which make for personality, God is as impotent without man as man is impotent without God."

"Whether self-hood, self-consciousness, self-control, and the power to know, are true of the Reality which is the indwelling and directive power in the universe, we may not be in position to say. *It is not true in any sense which these words bear in our human experience and speech.*"

The King eternal, immortal, invisible, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto is reduced, in the fashion of von Hartmann, to unconscious will. "It would be idle to look primarily elsewhere for the personality of God than in the ends which are being realized in our world."

Prof. Beckwith assigns to this wraith of God neither "a divine memory nor a divine anticipation, distinct and separate from the world-process." "No defensible doctrine of revelation could guarantee the validity of belief of an absolute foreknowledge of all events which lie in the bosom of the future."

"Apart from the universe God is unconceivable." We have arrived at a pantheism which is hardly more than a polite name for atheism. "There is no beyond, no heaven removed from the world as a dwelling-place for the divine." Solomon's prayer of dedication, "Hear thou in heaven thy dwelling-place," is as antiquated as the worship of Olympian Zeus.

"The idea of God detached from social experiences in which it gets its only meaning and reduced to metaphysical terms, is

a pale and worthless abstraction." Prof. Ames likens it to the image which the child seeks behind the mirror. That glorious thing democracy has hypnotized Prof. Beckwith as so many other theologians. "It will be impossible to preserve the absolute and irresponsible sovereignty of God when earthly kings have been deposed. . . . Even Fatherhood, if it represents simply a paternal instead of an all-pervading ministry of love, will cease to represent God to the democratic society."

When one renounces the God of revelation, one naturally lays little value on supposed revelation. "To hold that supernatural revelation communicates truth which is otherwise inaccessible to the reason is to allege an impossible definition of reason and revelation." Prof. Beckwith draws the logical consequence and quotes H. G. Wells, Samuel Butler, Whitman's *Leaves of Grass,* and like modern literature, much more often than the Scriptures.[63]

Prof. Youtz of Oberlin [*The Enlarging Conception of God*] is equally scornful of the biblical conception of God. Of the atoning work of Christ, he speaks in such terms as "cheap absolutions." There is no forgiveness of sin. "The wages of sin is death and the wages will be promptly paid on pay-day. . . . Men are not easily persuaded by religious doctrines which speak of a deity who transcends the moral law or who abrogates it to save men from the consequence of their transgressions or to lift them to heavenly places."

So do they count the blood of the covenant a thing of naught in the Oberlin of President Finney and Asa Mahan and J. H. Fairchild.

"Righteousness cannot be 'imputed.' It must be achieved." "Jesus was not like some prince from a royal household sent to an outlying province with a tacit understanding that the laws were to be suspended for his royalty and that deference must be shown him. . . . He had no mysterious stock of grace to draw on in emergencies to sustain him above common men. . . . And the forces at his command, the legions of angels—I

do not know what that means, but I believe that the same cosmic forces are at my disposal when I require them."

Naturally, "we are not coerced by any presupposition of the uniqueness of the Bible." "In all history, the tendency to deify holy books is observable. The Vedas, the Koran, and the Christian Bible, are cases in point." The Bible is not regarded as a divinely given textbook of religion, a supernaturally accredited Word of God, a court of last appeal in matters of spiritual controversy. We can rest in no mythological or supernaturalistic account of Jesus' relationship to life.[64]

The predictive foreshadowings in the Old Testament of the coming Messiah mean nothing to Prof. Kemper Fullerton of the chair of the Old Testament at Oberlin. He does not, as the early church, find Christ in the Psalms. This is "Christologizing the Psalms." The great evangelical prophecy of the ninth of Daniel on which Israel was waiting at the advent is mere fancy. "It cannot be too strongly insisted upon," he tells us in *Prophecy and Authority,* "that predictive prophecy has always been immediately connected with *a non-moral theory of inspiration.*"

Of course, if there was no prediction of the first coming, there is none of a second. "Millennial expectations are vetoed." Small loss, for they tend to "hysteria and morbidness, manifestations of mental disease." All the repeated promises of a second coming which Christ made and his warnings to wait on it are dissolved into anticipations of "social improvement." Yet, he says, we can still repeat, "though in a sense somewhat different,"

> **Religion bears our spirits up**
> **While we expect that blessed hope,**
> **The bright appearing of our Lord,**
> **And Faith stands leaning on his Word.**[65]

To another Oberlin *savant,* Prof. Bosworth, we owe this flash of inspiration. "Jesus had felt himself charged as Messiah with the responsibility of making a success of the world." [*Christ in Everyday Life,* 211.]

Prof. W. J. Hutchins of Oberlin is now president of Berea College and is introducing the modernist interpretations to Appalachian mountaineers. Their chief textbook in the religious education course is Hutchins' *The Religious Experience of Israel.*

He commends in this book Kent's *Historical Bible* to his young people and his own point of view is distinctly Kentian. The old pronouncements are all here. "The Hebrews did not generally and clearly attain to the conviction of the one sole universal righteous God until the Babylonian exile." The suggestion is offered that the name Jehovah, "the origin of which is unknown," comes from the word meaning to blow. Thus Jehovah would be originally "the god of the tempest."

Abraham's historicity is doubtful. The stories which gather about him, at least some of them, "are true to truth rather than to history." The Genesis narrator "thinks of Jehovah as bidding him start upon a great adventure into the unknown." The narrative doubtless idealizes Abram as one who fights with kings. "Three hundred and eighteen men could scarcely have been a deciding factor in defeating the kings of the most powerful peoples of Asia." It is as unbelievable as the story of Marathon's six hundred.

Joseph was "rather priggish." The roots of the Passover go further back than one realizes from Exodus. "Four or five thousand years ago a rude nomad killed the first lamb of his flock and smeared its blood on the tent poles that no angry god might smite him with the plague. He then ate the flesh with the family as a sacrificial meal, thanking his god, who was supposed to be a sharer of his feast." The date of Daniel Prof. Hutchins can fix to a year. In touching phrase he tells of "the little groups of nameless fighters gathering around Judas Maccabaeus in the chill night air of the wilderness to hear the story of Daniel" [just off the press], "and to warm their hearts at the flames of his defiant, deathless fidelity."

President Hutchins finds another side to Josiah's reformation with its overthrow of Baal worship. "As it ruined hundreds

of village shrines it cut away the trellises upon which the religious life of thousands of people had been climbing for years. It meant the financial ruin, the degradation of hundreds of village priests who had cared with patient zeal for their shrines and ministered with real though superstitious comradeship to the religious life of the common people."[66]

This higher critical "sob-stuff" over the fall of Canaanite idolatry and nastiness is served up to the young people of Berea. It will help to explain a broadside the writer recently ran across in the Boston Public Library. "John G. Fee," this declared, "with his eighty-odd years is doing more real missionary work among the colored people and mountain whites than all the rest of the faculty at Berea. And yet the president had him retired from his Bible work in the college to make way for favorites. *Kentucky needs no Chicago University.*" Mr. Fee was the heroic founder of Berea.

The Haskell Lectureship at Oberlin was lately filled by Prof. Lake of the Harvard Theological School. When it is necessary to prove that the Harvard school is "non-sectarian," Prof. Lake is classified as an Episcopalian; when count is being made of the Unitarians in *Who's Who,* he heads the list. (C. R. 1925:422.) In an *Atlantic* article, Aug. 1924, he makes what appears to be a confession of atheism. "The devil," he writes, "is the ghost of primitive men and *God is the unborn life of the world that is yet to be.*" In the same article he says of prayer, "I do not believe that the religion of tomorrow will have any more place for petition than it will have for any other form of magic." In 1922 he delivered the Ingersoll Lecture on "Immortality and the Modern Mind." This is his *confessio fidei*: "I enjoy my own existence. I enjoy all of it: its bad, I fear, as well as its good. But I am not so much intoxicated by the love of my own individuality as to think it can be or ought to be immortal." Judicious people "think of eternal death as more comforting than the threat of eternal life."[68]

So then Prof. Lake who, as far as one can judge, believes neither in God nor devil, prayer nor the future life [in the

usual sense of the terms], is a teacher of Andover students, is invited by the theological faculty of Oberlin to lecture there and conducts "prayers" at Mt. Holyoke College and Union Seminary.

From the Methodist seminaries comes the same story. Bishop Mead has been obliged to call for the resignation of the faculty of the Iliff School of Theology. Professors in this school are acceptable preachers in the Unitarian church of Denver. A transcript of notes taken by students in Iliff classes shows the reason.[69]

"There are no prophecies in the Old Testament that refer to the Christ. Paul and Jesus are opposed to each other. If we want the truth we must get back to Jesus [that is, away from Paul's interpretation of Jesus' work].

"Judaism gives us a more exalted idea of God than does Christianity as interpreted by Paul, for with Judaism man could approach God directly, whereas, Paul insists that in order to approach God man must have a mediator.

"The story of the Virgin Birth can be accounted for by the fact that Hebrews believed that children were the direct gift of God, as seen in the story of the birth of Samuel. Such a story grew up round a man after he had become famous.

"The book of Revelation should not have a place in the Scriptures for its conception of God's character is heathenish."*

Garrett Biblical Institute is the most important of the Methodist seminaries. It was founded by John Dempster, a typical Methodist itinerant who also laid the foundations of the Boston University School of Theology. Its early patron, Eliza Garrett, was converted under the ministry of Peter Borein, of whom it was said, "It never occurred to him to think the sermon ended *until the hearer was saved.*"[70] Out of

*Mr. J. E. Bentley, M. A., S. T. B., M. R. E., of Iliff, is quoted in *Grace and Truth* for March, 1925, as follows: "'Ye must be born again,' Certainly I believe this. One day I woke up to find that this was the day that I was to take the hand of a fair lady and make her my wife. That day I was born again. Then one day a little boy was born into our home. I was born again. Surely I believe we must be born again."

this school of the prophets and missionaries of Methodism are coming, so we are told, such class-room notes as the following:

"We have no proof as to the existence of God, but we are inclined to think there should be one if there isn't one."

"We question if Jesus knew if there was a God or not."

"Conversion is a matter of education. Only those who have sinned need it."

"The wane in the revival spirit is a development, not a decay in religion."

"The best way to fight sin is to ignore its power."

"The Apostles' Creed is indeed very inadequate today, for it says things not true and leaves unsaid many things fundamental to a creed today."

"The all-important question today is not, 'What must we do to be saved?,' but, 'What must we do to be of service?' "

"We do not believe at all in the miraculous as such. It can all be explained on a more intelligible basis."[71]

Of Watts' lines, "See from His head, His hands, His feet, Sorrow and love flow mingled down," one Garrett professor is alleged to have remarked to his class, "That hymn is not fit to be sung in a slaughter house."[72] "Prof. Davison is described to me by a Garrett student," writes Dr. Rideout, "as a man with a sneer for nearly everything that pertains to the old-time religion."[73] Prof. H. F. Rall, who teaches theology, expounds a theology in his *Teachings of Jesus* which any Unitarian could commend.*

What the temper of the Boston University School of Theology is, can be perhaps fairly understood from the words of a recent graduate which are quoted in the official *Boston University*

*Review in C.R. 1918:1002. "The book is wholly unorthodox. No reader could gather that the author was a Methodist or had the slightest interest in any of the traditional doctrines of the church. Any Unitarian scholar might have written and have been proud in writing the whole of it not excepting the twenty-third chapter, 'What Jesus Thought of Himself.' . . . It is to be wished that all Sunday schools, Unitarian or Trinitarian, might include classes working through this manual. The latter schools would miss all the elements which divide them from their liberal brethren."

Bulletin, Jan. 1925, p14. The Rev. M. A. Morrill is describing his divinity school experiences.

"We met all the bugaboos, not only the Isaiah brothers (there are four of them in the family, if memory serves me) and the documentary hypothesis for the Hexateuch, but the Johannine mystery to boot.

"It was news that there was a Christian cultus quite apart from Christ. . . . It was a novel experience to discover that God has never left himself without a witness. Christianity, to be sure, lost something of its sacrosanctity, but the loss never seemed regrettable. I am not a disciple of Buddha or of Laotse; I am trying to be a follower of Christ, but my Christianity is no longer an isolated phenomenon in the history of my world. . . . Many things are no longer believed—the fundamentalist brethren would be distressed to know how many of the old shibboleths, having lost their vitality, went overboard. . . . But Jesus Christ stands out. From the seminary I go into life feeling that nothing counts but Jesus."

The reading list for Methodist ministers which this faculty publishes commends the works of Peake, Gunkel, Skinner, Barton, Bewer, H. P. Smith, Troeltsch, Schweitzer, Fosdick [*Modern Use of the Bible* "earnestly recommended"], Kent, Youtz, Pratt's *Religious Consciousness,* Simkovitch. It is presumably graduates fed on such spiritual husks who fill thirty-two posts as presidents, deans, and principals, of Methodist universities, colleges and schools and seventy-eight professorships in theological seminaries and colleges. . . . This bulletin announces Harvard courses in philosophy, theology, and psychology, offered *without charge* to Boston University theological students [among them those of Profs. Lake and G. F. Moore]. Unlike the other seminaries reviewed, this school is hard pressed for funds and it is perhaps worth noting that it is a Unitarian publicist, Mrs. Mead, who makes appeal in the public press in its behalf; also that children in Methodist Sunday schools are pressed into the service of theological finance. Former students of this Boston school have borrowed from the

Children's Loan Day Fund of the Board of Education $219,218, of which only $97,360 has been repaid.[74]

"I am not afraid," wrote John Wesley, "that the people called Methodist should ever cease to exist in Europe or America, but I am afraid lest they should exist as a dead sect having the form of religion without the power. If ever Methodism is overthrown, it will be at the hands of her scholars who neither believe her doctrines nor practise her polity. These are the unreasonable men from whom it must purge itself or fall by its own weight"; and the Methodist bishops in 1840 expressed their doubts as to the expediency of establishing schools of divinity. "The history of such institutions admonishes us that the speculators of human science have but too frequently obscured and adulterated the doctrines of the revelation of God and that in many cases where these have been commenced on evangelical ground they have wandered into the dark regions of 'rational Christianity.' "[75]

One might go on indefinitely quoting this anti-Christian seminary literature. It is easy to imagine from it what the spiritual state of these institutions is. President Horr of Newton acknowledges their failure in Bible training. "Explain it how we will, it cannot be denied that our seminaries have graduated many men who . . . did not know the Bible." [*Inst. Bulletin,* Vol. 4, No. 2, p5.] Hartford Seminary* was founded for "the promotion of revivals [and] the defense of evangelical truth against prevailing error" [Constitution of Pastoral Union]. Indeed it can be said to have grown out of

*One of the Hartford defenders of *veritas evangelica,* Dr. L. B. Paton, Nettleton Professor of Old Testament, gives a seminary course on magic, myth, and taboo. He finds the roots of Christianity in the primitive cults of the dead. The religion of Jehovah grew out of Baal worship. "The dark holy of holies of Solomon's Temple with its anteroom in which a lamp was kept burning and bread and incense were offered was the counterpart of the ancient Canaanite tomb. . . . Sacrifice is a rite that has meaning only in the cult of the dead. . . . All such sacrifices and libations for the dead were appropriated by Yahveh." —*Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead,* 11, 18, 19, 20.

At the semi-centenary of Hartford Seminary in 1884 Prof. Wm. Thompson warned against those who might think the time ripe "to

the ministry of the Evangelist Nettleton. A bulletin of this seminary now tells us that "the significance of the polemic clause . . . has decreased with the passing years. The clause respecting 'revivals' also no longer implies . . . advocacy of some specific method of quickening religious life."[76] Little do the "moderns" concern themselves with the salvation of souls. The very phrase is unreal and embarrassing to them. Unbelief is so widespread among theological students as a consequence of their contact with dechristianized faculties that evangelical students headed by Princeton are withdrawing from the Students Association of Middle Atlantic Theological Seminaries and are organizing a new group, one certainly which will have no representation from the Unitarian seminary at Meadville as the older association had.* Years ago (1895) the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church urged churches to debar Union Seminary graduates from their pulpits.[77] When the situation in the seminaries is more generally understood, similar precautions will doubtless be taken against other seminaries.

It may be added that education at these seminaries is very expensive as well as of little use to the evangelical churches. While the annual per capita cost of education in the public school is $39 per child, in the high schools $127; in colleges and professional schools $466, that at Andover, Hartford, and Oberlin for example mounts to $2,000![78]

The answer which "the moderns" give when charged with betrayal of the wishes and purposes of founders is that they represent a progress which the advance of knowledge has rendered inevitable and which the founders themselves would, if

exchange signals with those who deny the authority of Scripture and the expiatory nature of Christ's death" [i. e., Unitarians] and called upon the successors of Taylor and Nettleton to a fearless discharge of their trust in case "rationalist speculators attempt to use our consecrated funds" for purposes alien to those for which the seminary was founded.

*The statement of the Princeton students declares co-operation possible only among organizations with a common purpose; insists that certain seminary organizations have repudiated evangelical Christianity while still using traditional phraseology and expresses regret that an organization fostered by conservative leaders and promising great things should fall short of its evangelical standards.

living, commend and even accompany. This contention is without support in fact. The men who founded Union and Andover and Oberlin and Rochester were quite familiar with twentieth century dechristianized thought in its eighteenth century dress and execrated it. They built Christian institutions to protect the church against it. All this becomes clear when one ranges the utterances of the present-day "liberal theologian" alongside those of the eighteenth century "infidel."

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Prentiss, *Union Theological Seminary,* 11, 116. 2. L. F. Stearns, *Henry Boynton Smith,* 149. 3. E. F. Hatfield, *The Early Annals of Union Theological Seminary,* 17. 4. Hatfield, *op. cit.* 27. 5. *Union Seminary and the Church of Christ*: Statement of Board of Directors. 6. *Address at Dedication of New Buildings,* 59. 7. *Quarter Centennial Celebration of the University of Chicago,* 130. 8. *The God of the Early Christians,* 47. 9. *Princeton Review,* 1924, 587. 10. Rihbany, *A Far Journey,* 328. 11. *Christianity in the Apostolic Age,* 51, 52, 174, 453, 575, 465, 238, 400. 12. *Union Theo. Sem. Bulletin,* 1918. 13. U. T. S. *Bulletin,* 1922. 14. U. T. S. *Bulletin,* 1921. 15. Prentiss, *op cit.* 190. 16. Coe, *The Religion of a Mature Mind,* 251, 330, 345, 332, 385, 44, 22, 12, 114, 90. *Psychology of Religion,* xiv 157, 199, 311, 321, 190, 185, 186. 17. *The History and Religious Value of the Fourth Gospel,* 5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 30, 38, 39, 55, 63, 80. 18. *Harvard Theological Review,* 1911, 4 and 16. 19. *Inaugural Address of Prof. H. B. Smith,* 55. 20. H. S. Coffin, *The Seminary: its Spirit and its Aims,* 19. 21. Prentiss, *op. cit.* 136. 22. Goodspeed, *History of the University of Chicago,* 67. 23. *Id.* 76-78. 24. *University of Chicago*: Biographical Sketches, E. Nelson Blake. 25. C.R. 1912:247. 26. *Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention,* 1923:139-141. 27. C.R. 1923:736. 28. C.R. 1923:209. 29. C.R. 1923:103. 30. C.R. 1914:711. 31. Kelly, *Theological Education in America,* 104. 32. *Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention,* 1920, 136. 33. *Annual of the N. B. Convention,* 1921:58. 34. *Id.* 60. 35. *Id.* 68-70. 36. *Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion,* 70. 37. *Id.* 128, 155. 38. Case, *The Millennial Hope,* 116, 146. 39. *Guide to the Study,* 268, 263, 267, 282, 258. 40. R.E. 1910:84. 41. *Guide to the Study,* 516, 568, 571. 42. *Id.* 633, 590, 673. 43. Foster, *The Finality of the Christian Religion,* 132, 222, 434, 444, 442, 482, 483, 405, 429, 401, 514, 510, 417, 464, 134. 44. Ames, *Psychology of Religious Experience,* 317, 313, 300, 269, 272, 215, 351, 265. 45. Willett, *Our Bible,* 173, 156, 143. 46. Goodspeed, *Story of the New Testament,* 144. 47. R.E. 7:31. 48. Hoben, *The Church School of Citizenship,* 153, 156. 49. Rosenberger, *Through Three Centuries,* 92, 97, 98. 50. *Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention,* 1922:204. 51. Cross, *Creative Christianity,* 11, 34, 38, 24, 40, 57, 69, 88, 120, 123, 128. 52. Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel,* 85, 266, 202, 151, 48, 178, 180, 101, 209. 53. *Report of the Quarter Centennial of Univ. of Chicago,* 125. 54. A. H. Strong, *Tour of Missions,* 189. 55. R.E. 1918:209. 56. *Rochester Seminary Bulletin,* 68th year, No. 1, 50. 57. C.R. 1922:1111. 58. C.R. 1914:1118. 59. Vedder, *Fundamentals of Christianity,* 191-2. 60. C.R. 61. *Crozer Quarterly,* July, 1924, 334. 62. Webster, *Christian Education and National Consciousness in China.* 63. Beckwith, *Idea of God,* 3, 8, 4, 282, 330, 301, 299, 270, 266,

61, 33, 16. 64. Youtz, *Enlarging Conception of God,* 40, 41, 43, 173, 115, 124, 131. 65. Fullerton, *Prophecy and Authority,* 189, 200, 204. 66. Hutchins, *Religious Experience of Israel,* 68, 74, 40, 41, 46, 457, 270. 67. *Save Berea College for Christ and Humanity.* 68. K. Lake, *Immortality and the Modern Mind,* 36, 68. 69. Letter of Wm. Parker to H. P. Sloan, Feb. 9, 1924. 70. Garrett Biblical Institution, Semi-Centennial Celebration, 139. 71. Quoted in *The Pentecostal Herald,* June 2, 1921. 72. Mss. letter. 73. *Pentecostal Herald,* June 22, 1921 74. *Boston University Bulletin,* Jan., 1925, 20. 75. Quoted in Rideout, *The Present Crisis in Methodism,* 10-17. 76. *Hartford Seminary Foundation Bulletin,* 49. 77. Statement of Board of Directors, Union Theological Seminary. 78. Kelly, *Theological Education in America.*

CHAPTER VIII

MODERNIST ANTIQUES, OR THE OLD AND THE NEW ENLIGHTENMENT

> The new-fledged infidel of *modern* brood
> Climbed the next fence, clapped both his wings and crowed.
>
> —Timothy Dwight in 1788.

"IF old Reimarus (1694-1768) were to come back again," says Schweitzer,[1] "he might confidently give himself out to be the latest of the modernists."* The main lines of destructive criticism were laid out long before the nineteenth century opened. Some of the most important features of Pentateuchal criticism appear as far back as the seventeenth century in Spinoza and Astruc. In 1739 Parvish defended the theory that Deuteronomy was written in the seventh century B. C. His contemporary, the English free-thinker Anthony Collins, elaborating a thesis which the anti-Christian controversialist Porphyry had propounded in the third century A. D., made of the book of Daniel a product of Maccabæan

*That the term "modernist" applied to 17th and 18th century unbelief is only superficially an anachronism appears from a brief account of V. Weigel (1533-88) by Prof. Gruetzmacher (*Moderne Irrtuemer im Spiegel der Geschichte*). Weigel's denial of God's transcendence came probably from the atheism of the Italian Renaissance although Weigel as Christian minister clothed his heresy in Christian phrase. God comes to himself, to personality and activity, first in and with the world. God being immanent in man, human personality is the source of religion and the history of religion is the history of the unaided triumph of the divine in man over evil. It is clear from Grossgebauer's criticism of Weigel that the seventeenth century had come to much the same discussions and conclusions in biblical criticism as present day modernism. The age of biblical writings was doubted, they were full of interpolations, the prophecies were written after the events [especially in the case of Daniel], the prophets were in favor as compared with the Pentateuch, the biblical narrative is largely legendary, etc.

days. The notion served up to young people in college textbooks as "modern," that Ruth was written in protest against Nehemiah's marriage policies, has passed its century mark. Even older is that of Prof. Fowler that Israel got in Babylon its larger religious outlook. "Now came the era," wrote Lessing, "when the conceptions of Him should be widened, ennobled, and purified, and this was done during the captivity. . . . The Jews became acquainted with a nation which had a more spiritual conception of God than the Hebrew people itself had. The Hebrew nation came back from the captivity wiser than it went."[2] Semler called the story of Esther a myth. Tom Paine insisted that it was "priestly ignorance which imposed this book [Isaiah] upon the world as the writing of Isaiah."

John the Presbyter, that shadowy figure of present-day criticism, was first summoned up by Dionysius of Alexandria [three centuries after Christ]. The modern *alogi* who seek to discredit John's Gospel echo those of the second century.

Chubb, the English deist, describes the God of Israel as "not the Supreme Being but only some tutelary, subordinate god consonant to the pagan idolatry."* So Prof. Badé of the Congregational seminary in Berkeley: "There is good reason to believe that Jahveh was worshipped among the Canaanites as a local divinity in pre-Israelite times. In that case he must have figured as a local Baal long before the Hebrew prophets began their reform."[3]

Bolingbroke speaks of Jehovah as "a local tutelary deity carried about in a trunk."[4] Dr. Fosdick, in the historic First Presbyterian Church, New York, used a variant expression. The Ark of the Covenant is "the box that God travels in."

*"Here is the great triumph of the critiques. They believe to see here an entire equality between Chemos, god of the Ammonites and Adonai, god of the Jews. They are convinced that each little people had its own god as each army its general. Chemos, Dagon, Moloch, were different names signifying the same thing, the Lord of the place. Each people fought under the standards of its god as the barbarous people of Europe fought under the standards of their saints after the destruction of the Roman empire. Our unbelievers insist that this fact is fully recognized by Jephtha."—VOLTAIRE, *La Bible enfin expliqué*, 242.

Voltaire, as Prof. Hutchins, ridicules the story of Abraham pursuing the kings as an impossibility.

The modern puts Paul in opposition to Christ and pits the prophets against the sacrificial system of Israel. So did the deists.* The New Testament contains two different systems according to Bolingbroke, contrary to each other—that of Christ and that of Paul. Only the first is genuine Christianity.[5] And Collins in his *Discourse on Freethinking,* treating of the Jewish sacrificial system, starts this echo from Badé one hundred and fifty years later.

"The prophets writ with as great liberty against the established religion of the Jews which the people looked on as the institution of God himself, as if they looked upon it all to be imposture."—COLLINS, *Leland* 1:97.

"The prophets who had denied that God had instituted sacrifices or could be propitiated by means of them, were condemning an economic abuse as well as a religious superstition."—PROF. BADÉ, *op. cit.* 297.

"The Scriptures cannot be broken," said our Lord. Bolingbroke describes them as "coming down to us broken and confused, full of additions, interpolations and transpositions. They are nothing more than compilations of old traditions and abridgments of old records made in later times." Prof. Cross of Rochester Seminary thinks as little of them. "The ultimate originals [of the Gospels] are not documents at all, but stories and teachings circulated by oral transmission . . . from one generation to another, supported and vivified by the florid imagination of the oriental mind."[6]

Semler (1725-90) would "separate the eternal truth in Scripture from the local and temporary." This is Dr. Fosdick's "decode their [the Gospels'] abiding meaning from outgrown phraseology."[7] It is the line which the deist Morgan also took.† He inveighs again and again against all

*Reimarus: "We are justified in drawing an absolute distinction between the teaching of the apostles in their writings and what Jesus himself in his life time proclaimed and taught."—SCHWEITZER, *Quest,* 16.

†C. F. Bahrdt, a low-living infidel of the Paine type though more learned, insisted that only such passages in the Bible could be accepted as "commended themselves to the thoughtful." "The thoughtful" too were an eighteenth century phenomenon.

historical fact recorded in the Gospels as having nothing to do with the Christian faith. He also distinguishes between the religion of the "Christian Jews" and the "Christian deists." The first are "mechanical"; the second, "real and moral."[8]

So are present-day goats divided from the sheep with the terms "static" and "dynamic."

But Morgan in this particular was but an embryonic Schleiermacher, and "veil-makers" are now-a-days as common as toadstools after rain.

"It is not essential to Christianity," writes "veil-maker" Fitch, "to see [Christ] as the incarnation of historical truth. That is to say, it is beside the point whether every statement regarding external events, whether made by him or about him, corresponds with fact. . . . The infancy narratives, the dogma of the Virgin Birth, the resurrection story, may or may not be true."[9]

So the deist Collins insisted that "Christianity was true ideally but not historically."

In this process of "decoding," the historical occurrences of the Gospel are resolved into allegory. The story of the miraculous draught of fishes, Dr. Fosdick suggests, "may be a sermon on the failure of evangelism when carried on without Christ and the success of it when Christ directs. . . . Our occidental minds probably miss many symbolical literary devices in an oriental book and this may be one of them."[10] "The miracles of John's Gospel," says Prof. N. Schmidt, "seem to be intended as allegories. They are exaggerated to such a point as to raise at least the question whether they were at all meant to be taken as narratives of actual occurrences."[11]

So thought the deist Woolston.

"Let not these seeming miracles deceive you. That blind man whose sight I have restored, that lame, that leper, that dead person to whom I have given soundness and limb and life itself, are not really and actually cured: whatever I do of this kind is only by way of figure and allegory to denote my much greater

performances in curing men's errors and ignorance and want of intellectual knowledge of God."

Woolston says of the raising of Lazarus, "It will always be objection enough against this miracle that it was never once mentioned by the first historians nor indeed invented by the last until he was above an hundred years old and everybody dead that should have confuted him."[12] Prof. Kent repeats this objection and explains the narrative with the help of Woolston's theory of allegory.

The silence of the synoptic gospels, he tells us, "suggests that the story of the raising of Lazarus was unknown not only to Paul and the twelve but also to the first generation of gospel writers. It was quite possible that the evangelist never intended his account as literal history, but rather as an allegorical illustration of Jesus' spiritual power."[13]

Modernist explanations of miracles might have been lifted bodily out of eighteenth century free-thinkers' writings.

"'Tis highly probable," says Woolston of the woman with the issue of blood, "that her distemper was but some slight indisposition, a little bleeding at the nose now and then or some such small evacuation as might have been a means to prolong her life. Her cure is imputed to the touch of the hem of his garment when it was in reality the pure effort of a strong imagination."—In SYKES, *Fair Statement,* 111.

Prof. G. A. Barton in like phrase: "She touched him. She felt sure her infirmity was gone. It is probable that her trouble was of a sort upon which the mental and nervous reactions of the body have a great influence."—*Jesus of Nazareth,* 212.

I recall hearing one evening in Allahabad a Hindu street preacher denounce Jesus for "the murder of a tree." The modernists of the eighteenth and twentieth centuries vie with each other in similar expressions of indignation.

"This one instance of his cursing the fig-tree in such a rash, extravagant manner, spoils the credit and sullies the glory of all his other works."—WOOLSTON, *op. cit.* 140.

"An act of petulant injustice even to a tree."—PROF. G. A. BARTON, *op. cit.* 320.

Modern attempts to connect historically the sacrificial death of Jesus with Mithraism and other pagan religions have their precedent in deist literature. Thus,

"The taurobolia or the blood-bedaubing of a man in a pit all over with the blood of a bull which fell on him through holes made in the plank on which the beast was slain was believed to wash away all his sins and he, happy man, regenerated to eternity. . . . Natural religion which puts the whole stress on internal penitence and true virtue in the soul will be despised as allowing no computing or compounding with Heaven." — MATTHEW TINDAL, *Christianity as Old as Creation*, 128.

"Washing in the blood of a sacrificed victim to the washing away of sin was the supreme act of men who were grieved and wearied with the burden of their sins. The Taurobolium and the Criobolium were familiar in many lands. Their essential idea is still a favorite one in many Christian circles. 'There is a fountain filled with blood.'"—S. D. MCCONNELL, *The Confessions of an Old Priest*, 68.

Reinhard, an eighteenth century rationalist, interpreted the Kingdom of God as a universal ethical reorganization of mankind. (Schweitzer.) Jesus was a social reformer. Through the attainment of "the highest perfection of which society is capable universal peace was gradually to be brought in." Kant's millennarian optimism was of the same type and indeed these were among the dominating ideas of the *Aufklaerung*. The old liberal apocalyptic, slight as its basis in Scripture or history, has become in America widely prevalent. "I believe in the victory of righteousness upon this earth, in the coming of the kingdom of God, but I do not believe in the physical return of Jesus."[14]

Here again Dr. Fosdick is at one with the deists.

"The best interpreters own the apostles were grossly mistaken [as to the Lord's coming]. If most of the apostles were mistaken in a matter of this consequence, can we be certain that any of them may not be mistaken in other matters?"—TINDAL, *op. cit.* 259, 262.

"The facts of history have shown that Paul was in error in his teaching about the coming of the Lord. . . . It is a palpable infidelity to truth to affirm that this teaching was true."—BURTON AND GOODSPEED, *A Guide to the Study*, 236.

Tom Paine's leading ideas, which were merely his statement of current eighteenth century ideas in criticism and theology, are now prominent in many Protestant seminaries. Thus,

"My intention is to show that those books are spurious and that Moses is not the author of them and still further that they were not written in the time of Moses but by some very ignorant and stupid pretenders to authorship several hundred years after the death of Moses."*—*The Age of Reason,* 80.

"The first time the law called the law of Moses made its appearance was in the time of Josiah about a thousand years after Moses was dead."—*Letter to Mr. Erskine,* 171.

Prophecy is "shooting with a long bow of a thousand years to strike within a thousand miles of a mark."—*The Age of Reason,* 67.

"The presumption is that the books called the Evangelists were not written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, and that they were impositions. The disordered state of the history in these four books implies that they are the production of some unconnected individuals many years after the things they pretend to relate. . . .

"The fact that certain sections of Deuteronomy laid claim to Mosaic authorship and that much of the law of Deuteronomy was couched in the form of a public address of Moses and purported to have been written down by him was the basis of the Jewish view that he had written the whole not only of the laws but of the five books in which they are contained. This view is not supported by the facts."—H. L. WILLETT, *The Moral Leaders of Israel,* 30.

"The proofs of the origin of the Deuteronomic law in the days shortly preceding the great reformation of Josiah are so convincing that biblical scholarship increasingly holds the view."—WILLETT, *op. cit.* 189.

"The present essay seeks to show that the fact of predictive prophecy has been maintained only by means of a false principle of exegesis. . . . The theory of predictive prophecy must be abandoned."—K. FULLERTON, *Prophecy and Authority,* xvii.

"The tradition which connects the Gospel with the name of Matthew is of no weight. . . . It is evidently from the pen of a Christian of the second or third generation." — MCGIFFERT, *History of Apostolic Christianity,* 575.

"The weight of scholarly opinion is settling down to a conviction that the traditional theory (as

*"Those who believe that a Levite of the time of the kings is the author of Deuteronomy are confirmed in their opinion by this passage. . . . They have suspected that the whole Pentateuch was written by some Levite 872 years after Moses at the time of King Josiah. This book, then unknown, was found at the bottom of a chest by the high priest Hilkiah, when he counted his money."—VOLTAIRE, *La Bible enfin expliqué,* 202.

They have been manufactured by other persons than those whose names they bear."—*The Age of Reason,* 126.

"The Jews have stolen their cosmogony and brought it with them from Babylon on their return."—*Reply to the Bishop of Llandaff,* 254.

"It is not difficult to account for the credit that was given to the story of Jesus Christ being the son of God. He was born when the heathen mythology had prepared people for the belief of such a story. Almost all the extraordinary men that lived under the heathen mythology were reputed to be the sons of some of their gods."—*The Age of Reason,* 29.

"Not any two of these writers agree in reciting exactly in the same words the written inscription, short as it is, which they tell us was put over Christ when he was crucified. We may infer from this that those writers, whoever they were and in whatever time they lived, were not present at the scene."—*The Age of Reason,* 126.

"A man is preached instead of God; an execution is an object for gratitude. The preachers daub themselves with the blood like a troop of assassins. They preach a humdrum sermon on the merits of the execution."—*The Age of Reason,* 148.

"When men are taught to believe that Jesus by his death rubs all off and pays their passage to heaven gratis they become as careless in morals as a spendthrift would be of money were he told that his father had engaged to pay off all his scores."—PAINE, *Misc. Pieces,* 312.

to the authorship of John) must be abandoned."—E. F. SCOTT, *Fourth Gospel,* 5.

"Back of this narrative (Genesis) lay the old Babylonian story of creation."—FOWLER, *Origin and Growth,* 145.

"The virgin birth is not to be accepted as an historical fact. To believe in virgin birth as an explanation of great personality is one of the familiar ways in which the ancient world was accustomed to account for unusual superiority. Especially is this true of the founders of great religions."—FOSDICK, *Shall the Fundamentalists Win?*

"Just what the inscription on the cross over the head of Jesus really was we shall never know though all four evangelists state what it was. But each states it differently."—STRICKLAND, *Foundation of Christian Belief,* 244.

"Of all the slanders men have perpetrated against the Most High this is positively the most impudent, the most insulting. No, sin cannot be escaped by a bloody sacrifice. Jesus never taught and never authorized anybody to teach in his name that he suffered in our stead and bore the penalty of our sins."—VEDDER, *Lay Sermons* (in the *Chester News*).

"Guilt and merit are personal. They cannot be transferred from one person to another. We tamper with moral truths when we shuffle them about."—RAUSCHENBUSCH, *A Theology for the Social Gospel,* 245.

"The Christian system of religion is an outrage on common sense. Why is man afraid to think?"—*Misc. Pieces,* 303.

"Does the orthodox ever think?" —VEDDER, *Fundamentals of Christianity,* 192.

Paine was a shabby creature with the slightest of training. This did not hinder him from saying, "It does not appear that Jesus had any school education and the probability is that he could not write."[15] The modernist Dr. McConnell speaks of our Lord, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom, in similar terms. "To the great treasury of human knowledge it cannot be said that he added anything. In science, literature, government, economics, he seems to have been upon the same level as the average uneducated man of his time. He uncovered no secret of nature. He gave no counsel as to the right ordering of human affairs."*[16]

The German von Ammon did what is so commonly done at present, put the modernism of his day in parallel with its evangelicism. Let us compare his modernist column with one of our own time.[17]

"The writings called the sacred Scriptures are not more sacred than the works of Plato or Virgil."

"The gift of inspiration overpasses the boundaries of religion. God came to Confucius, to Zoroaster, to men of religion who had no place in either the Old Testament or the New."—HODGES, *How to Know the Bible,* 14.

"All that is called miraculous ought either to be considered as mythical or to be explained in a perfectly natural manner."

There is a "deadly unreality in our thought of miracle. Prevalent religious thought has taught the modern man to put miracle and law in contradiction."—FOSDICK, *Modern Use of the Bible,* 154. [See foot-note† on p. 221.]

"The personality of God cannot be affirmed; it is confounded with the soul of the world."

"The universe as we see it is God's body; then God is the soul of the universe."—J. H. Randall quoted by FOSDICK, *Modern Use,* 266.

*Roehr describes Jesus as "a man, the product of his age and nation. Those who deny this are stupid, servile and literal." So Kent, "Jesus in his conception of nature, in his apparent belief in a personal devil and in his acceptance of the Jewish tradition regarding the origin and authorship of the Jewish Scriptures showed himself in many respects a son of his age and race."—*Life and Teaching of Jesus,* 271.

"The doctrine of angels has no reality. It is only a consequence of Judaeo-Chaldean myths."	"Mental categories which we no longer use in ordinary life like angelology. . . . When Zoroasterism had done its work, the flexible and fluid Hebrew angelology had been frozen into Persian form."—FOSDICK, *Modern Use,* 89, 123.
"Christ came into the world in the same way as other men."	"They phrase it [the advent of Jesus] in terms of a biological miracle that our modern minds cannot use."—FOSDICK, *The New Knowledge and The Christian Faith.*
"The future judgment is only a rabbinical vision."	The Greeks "did not understand Jewish apocalypticism, its catastrophic arrival of the day of judgment. Must we go back to ways of thinking which developed between the Testaments?"—FOSDICK, *Modern Use,* 108, 9.
'The cures which Jesus worked might have been effected by others and those whom he resuscitated were only in a lethargic state."	Lazarus fell into a comatose state which was mistaken for death. Jesus himself tells us that it was only a sleep."—PROF. G. A. BARTON, *Jesus of Nazareth,* 266.

Strauss gathered up in masterly fashion the whole literature of free-thought which preceded his day. It would be a fruitful undertaking to examine whether there is a single objection, argument, sneer, wound in Christ's body to be found in American theological literature which cannot be traced back to the *Leben Jesu* or to Strauss' minor writings.*

Dr. Fosdick, for example, repeatedly puts in contrast the new age and the old. "The days come, however, as they have come now, when the church moves out into a new generation with new ways of thinking and new outlooks on the universe.

†"They blaspheme God when they represent him as angry with his creatures, as punishing the innocent for the guilty and as pacified by the sufferings of the virtuous. They blaspheme the universe because in their zeal to miraculize everything they rest the proof of theology on the interruptions to order rather than on order itself."—SHAFTESBURY, Quoted in Stephen's *History of English Thought,* 2:27.

*"These sections (of the *Leben Jesu*)," says Schweitzer (Quest. 84), "marked out the ground which is now occupied by modern critical study."

Ideas never dreamed of before, such as scientific law and evolution, become the common property of well-instructed minds."[18] In Strauss' *The Old Faith and the New,* we get a dissertation on "the modern cosmic conception and the old ecclesiastical one," quite in Dr. Fosdick's style, and this is elsewhere illustrated with a statement from Kant which indicates how old the evolutionary "dream" really is. "The resemblance of so many species of animals in regard to a certain general scheme which seems to underlie not only the structure of their skeleton but the arrangement of their other parts as well" . . . seemed to Kant to imply descent and justify the assumption of a gradual development of organic beings "from man down to the neophyte." Strauss then quotes Kant's suggestion that "an orangoutang or a chimpanzee might be enabled to develop his various organs into the human structure, his brain into an organ of thought which might then gradually be further developed by social culture."[19]

Strauss also speaks of modern astronomical science as "dispossessing the ancient personal God of his habitation. He who has a clear cosmical conception in harmony with the present standpoint of astronomy can no longer represent to himself a deity throned in heaven and surrounded by angelic hosts."[20] This was Shaftesbury's idea also. Prof. Youtz, in his *Enlarging Conception of God,* plagiarizes it from the past. He speaks of "the pagan conception of heaven where God dwells apart" [as if the idea of an *anima mundi* were not pagan]. "We must not preach him as 'Lord of all being throned afar,' but as the power at work in our human world."

Prof. Shotwell's Amherst lectures on "The Religious Revolution of Today" are highly unoriginal variations on a theme of Strauss. "Although up to a certain point," says Strauss, "religion and civilization may go hand in hand, this nevertheless happens only so long as the civilization of nations manifests itself in the shape of imagination; as soon as it comes to be a culture of the reasoning faculties and more especially as soon as it is manifested through observation of Nature and her

laws, an opposition gradually develops itself which circumscribes religion more and more. The religious domain in the human soul resembles the domain of the Red Indians in America, which however much we may deplore or deprecate it, is year after year reduced within ever narrowing limits by their white neighbors."[21]

"One might run over the history of Christianity," writes Prof. Shotwell, "and watch its superstitions wear away in the light of a steadily dawning intelligence."*

"On Ascension day," says Strauss, "it becomes difficult to refrain from satire. To speak of this event as one of actual occurrence is simply to affront educated people at this time of day."[22] So Dr. Fosdick: "In such an easily picturable world the farewell of Jesus to the earth could be imagined literally as a physical levitation until he was received into heaven a definite distance above the ground. . . . The marvel is not that such a picture of the Master's going and return should arise [but] that after that old world had been so long outgrown . . . many folk should still retain the old picture of our Lord's ascent."[23]

Dr. Fosdick, as Strauss, derides the Scriptural idea of a chosen nation. "Nations have thought themselves God's chosen people above all his other children because they seemed so to themselves." And Strauss: "The one God was . . . not in like manner the Lord God of nations in the fullest sense; only that of the little tribe of his worshippers in comparison to whom he treated the other nations as step-children. From this proceeded something harsh, rigid, irascible, in the whole character of this God." "I knew a village," wrote the sixty-year Bible student, Prof. W. N. Clarke, "where" [actually!] "the favorite topic of conversation was the return of the Jews to

*Strauss repeats Bolingbroke as Shotwell Strauss: "The clergy will agree," says Bolingbroke, "that Christianity has been in decay ever since the resurrection of letters. . . . As soon as the means of acquiring and spreading information grew common it is no wonder a system was unveiled which could not have been woven with success in any age but those of gross ignorance and credulous superstition."—*Works,* I:185.

Palestine."[24] "How could God give them that little spot of Palestine for ever and ever from which they have been driven for so long a time?" wrote Voltaire under the impression of the same Zionist absurdity.[25]

One could go on indefinitely putting the interpretations and aphorisms of neo-Straussian "evangelicals" alongside those of Strauss himself. Here are a few culled at random:

"It is utterly impossible for us to conceive the creator embodied in one single created being. That the deity should reveal itself in all finite beings of the universe together we do readily admit and indeed we are obliged to do so, but that it should descend with all its fullness into one finite being,—this appears to us as absurd as that the nature of harmony might reveal itself in one single tone."—STRAUSS, *Soliloquies,* 38.

"The Logos involved the central assertion that God can come into the world which he has made and into man his child. This was the category which the New Testament used, not only in the Fourth Gospel but in a disguised form in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the great Christological passages in Paul. Jesus was essentially the forthgoing of God himself into his world. This philosophical approach to the understanding of Jesus is less congenial with our modern minds. . . . The modern mind often feels positive and indignant aversion against such theological construing of the Master."—FOSDICK, *The Modern Use,* 243.

"The idea of angels assisting to execute the decrees of God in the world and of a devil endeavoring to frustrate them [are] mere fictions which are inconsistent with the very fundamental doctrines of Christianity and only externally adopted from earlier religions. When these and similar prejudices shall have gradually been cleared away will not then the nature of Christianity itself shine forth in greater purity even than it could appear at the time of Jesus."—STRAUSS, *Soliloquies,* 63.

"No intelligent mind can possibly enter into demonology as a comprehensive category for human sin and misery. . . . Having frankly recognized the outgrown nature of the category we need not be troubled by it when we read the Bible. What we should seek to understand is the abiding experience." — FOSDICK, *Modern Use,* 121.

"No fear, then, that we should lose Christ by being obliged to give up a considerable part of what was hitherto called Christian creed. He will remain to all of

"Nor does this critical and skeptical attitude, discrediting in a sense Jesus' ideas, require us to lower our estimate of the personality of Jesus. . . . The modern

us the more surely the less anxiously we cling to the doctrines and opinions that might tempt our reason to forsake him."—STRAUSS, *Soliloquies,* 63.

"It is possible, and I myself have pointed out the possibility of the exclamation, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me' only being attributed to him in order that a psalm considered by the earliest Christianity as the program of the messianic agony might at its very commencement be applicable to him."—STRAUSS, *The Old and the New Faith,* 89.

man does not value the person and message of Jesus any the lower because Jesus shared the thought of his time on this subject."—G. B. FOSTER, *Finality of the Christian Religion,* 41.

"At certain points in the description of Jesus' crucifixion it would seem that not being eyewitnesses and lacking exact historical data the evangelists turned to the Old Testament prophecies for help in completing the picture."—KENT, *Life and Teachings of Jesus,* 290.

"We have freed ourselves from that other constituent of religion, ignoble and untrue in comparison with the sentiment of dependence,—the desire and expectation of obtaining something from God by our worship,"[26] says Strauss, which is Prof. Lake's belief "that the religion of tomorrow will have no more place for petition than for any other form of magic";[27] and in general the so-called modern and Unitarian conception of Christ's work is compactly stated by Strauss:

"Jesus is not a Saviour by his atoning death but by his teaching and example which exercise an elevating and therefore a redeeming influence upon us all; men are justified not through faith in another's righteousness but by faithfulness to their own conviction, that is, by the earnest endeavor always to shape action by a recognized standard of duty."[28]

Interest in personal salvation is represented as ignoble as dependence upon a prayer-answering God. Those who believe that "individual salvation is primary," says Dr. Fosdick [*Christianity and Progress*] "are believers in a narrow, individualistic Christianity." So Shaftesbury: "A policy which extends itself to another world and considers the future lives and happiness of men rather than the present has made us leap beyond the bounds of natural humanity. *The saving of souls is now the horrid passion of exalted spirits.*"[29]

Prof. Lake in scornful antiphon responds to Shaftesbury.

Of the expectation of a future life, "There may be reason to apprehend that a temper of this kind will extend itself through all the parts of life . . . creating a stricter attention to self-good and private interest and must insensibly diminish the affection toward public good or the interest of society."—SHAFTESBURY, *Characters*, Vol. 2: 58.

"In past generations to attain salvation was thought to be the object of existence. It is not altogether surprising that people who argued in this way contributed little to the improvement of the world."—K. LAKE, *Immortality and the Modern Mind*, 21.

And Prof. Elwood takes up the theme which Shaftesbury left to him some two hundred years ago.

"To be bribed only or terrified into our honest practise bespeaks little of real honesty or worth. . . . How shall we deny that to serve God by compulsion or of interest is merely servile and mercenary."—SHAFTESBURY, Vol. I:92 and II:272.

"In the theological ages of the Christian church salvation was often represented to mean essentially escape from punishment and assurance of bliss in a life beyond the grave. Thus the whole conception of salvation was degraded to a refined sort of selfishness."—ELWOOD, *Reconstruction of Religion*, 144.

Strauss parrots Holbach as Holbach parrots the ancients and Profs. Foster and Shotwell parrot Strauss. Thus, "The Epicurean derivation of piety from fear has incontestably a good deal of truth in it."—Strauss. "If we go back to the beginning we shall always find that ignorance and fear have created Gods."—Holbach. "The history of religion shows that belief in God dawned in the identification of nature powers exciting fear and awe."—Foster. "Religion is the reaction of mankind to something apprehended but not comprehended. The ancients made no more profound discovery than that fear created the gods."—Shotwell. Prof. Paul Elmer More traces from past to present a kindred theory (*Bross Lectures*, 1921), namely, that religion is but a device of tyranny to enable it to exploit men. "Polybius, the Greek historian of Rome, expressed the idea. Tacitus declared religion an *instrumentum regni*. So Bolingbroke, Holbach, La Mettrie, Leslie Stephen. And at last Mr. Dewey is renewing the old cry and persuading our young men

that religion is a fallacy of the reason devised to maintain the more fortunate classes in their iniquitous claims."

The eighteenth century sentimentalized over pagan religion in the best Parliament of Religion style. The Chinaman was the especial idealization of the time. "I am so far from thinking the maxims of Confucius and Jesus Christ to differ that I think the plain and simple maxims of the former will help to illustrate the more obscure ones of the latter," wrote the deist, Matthew Tindal. Chubb, also a deist, had as lofty an opinion of Islam. "Whether the Mohammedan revelation be of a divine original or not, there seems to be a plausible pretence arising from the circumstances of things for stamping a divine character upon it."[30] To Chubb it mattered not "whether a man adopts Judaism or Paganism or Mohammedanism or Christianity," and he fortifies this opinion with the favorite text of the Enlightenment, "In every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." "The God who works in Islam [with dripping scimitar] and in Buddhism [the true religious opiate of the East] is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Youtz, *The Enlarging Conception of God.*)

So Prof. Strickland, "We dare not declare these great faiths which countless millions of rational beings have professed for thousands of years to be nothing but error and delusion"[31] [no, not even if "science" may do so].

Not only is the substance of modernist writing a repetition of the unbelief of the past, but attitude, style, and phrasing, also. Shaftesbury insists on his "steady orthodoxy [as Dr. Fosdick on his evangelicism] his submission to the truly Christian doctrine of our holy church" and then proceeds to flout it all along the line. He contends that in rationalizing religion he is "attempting to win atheists to it." This, too, is a modern claim.

The Gospel must be made reasonable in order to "hold the college youth to the church." "I did not, nor do I now, desire to disturb the faith of anyone," wrote Strauss. "Only

where these are already shaken, I desire to point out the direction in which, according to my conviction, a firmer soil is to be found."[33]

The True Gospel of Jesus Christ Asserted is the title of the deist Chubb's work. Both old and new rationalists play the ethics of Jesus against the gospel of redemption. "No system can be more simple and plain than that of natural religion as it stands in the Gospel," wrote Bolingbroke. "Both the duties required to be practised and the propositions required to be believed are concisely and plainly enough expressed in the original Gospel which Christ taught and which his four evangelists recorded. But they have been alike corrupted by theology."[34] So also Semler in Frederick the Great's day contrasted "religion" and "theology" in the usual present-day style.

After destroying the Bible's authority, the rationalists of the eighteenth century praise the ethical residuum. Roehr, a German rationalist, gives us this sentence which might well have dripped from the pen of Sanders or Kent: "I honor the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the most precious treasure of religious truths from which with the help of a correct grammatico-historical exegesis, can be made a scientifically ordered vehicle for a pure and genuine religion of reason."[35]

"While [criticism] has taken away a certain kind of reverence which after all was merely a sort of superstition," writes Dr. F. G. Lewis of Crozer, "it has given the Bible worth and power which it could not possess before. In exchange for superficial sacredness there has been given knowledge, light, and strength."[36]

A characteristic trick of modernist phrasing of kinship to the past is the use of such terms as "scholars generally," "the consensus of learned opinion," etc. One gets this in C. F. Kent on almost every tenth page. " 'Many learned men pretend.' Why do you not name them?" ask the Six Jews of Voltaire. "We have always an ill opinion of these vague quotations. 'Some critiques maintain.' What critiques, sir? By not naming

them you give us room to think that you are the only critique in question."[37]

The same phrases of emancipation are on the lips of the Enlightenment in both centuries. "I invite all timid souls out into the liberty that I have found," writes the pompous Prof. W. N. Clarke of Colgate.[38] "My end is to hold forth the acceptable light of truth which makes men free, enables them to break the bands of creed-makers and imposters asunder and to cast their cords from them" are the no less pompous words of the deist Annet.[39] "Tolerance" and "enlightenment" were the two watchwords of the time. Pens overflowed with such expressions as duty, common welfare, humanity. Dr. McCartney, moderator of the Presbyterian church, has described the modernist of Lower Fifth Avenue as "scattering ashes; talking pleasantly about 'vision,' 'service,' 'progress,' 'toleration.'" Prof. Vischer of Halle urged pastors "to be silent concerning the silly stories of the historical Christ since people of standing no longer believe them."[40] A century later Dr. Ambrose Vernon of the Harvard church remarked that "people in Brookline will not believe in the Virgin Birth."[41] "As for us we will continue to turn our faces towards the East," is a phrase of Roehr's which in greater or less variation marks modernist literature. Adherents of evangelical Christianity Roehr brands as slaves of ignorance. The evangelical revival a century ago was dubbed *"das neues Obscurantentum."* In like manner Dr. Shailer Mathews, "Over against intelligence in religion is being organized anti-intelligence," and Dr. Fosdick after picturing "fresh young minds holding new ideas, not thinking in ancient [i. e., eighteenth century] terms," describes "the educated of the Middle West as seeking their religion outside the church because of the presence of fundamentalist opinion within it."[42]

On the one side science, education, light, progress, freshness, sun-rising, freedom. On the other all that is baroque and gloomy. Even the epithets of the past are revived by the modernist theologians of the present. Prof. Youtz of Oberlin

describes the worship of Jesus as "Christolatry," repeating a century-old word of Henke. When Prof. G. A. Johnston Ross applies the term "bibliolatry" to an evangelical paper he borrows his witticism from the same ancient source.

"Science" is of course monopolized by the Enlightenment both old and new. The word falls again and again from Tom Paine as if he really captained its body-guard. But the greatest figures in eighteenth century German science, Euler, the king of mathematicians and A. von Haller, the founder of modern physiology, made public affirmation of their evangelical faith. Euler's *Defense of Revelation against the Attacks of Free-thinking* affirms that the alleged difficulties in the Christian religion are not greater than those with which mathematicians have to contend and insists that *the refusal to accept the Bible as a revelation of God is an offense of the will.*

These few parallels are the meagre selection from a wholly casual reading. Sometime perhaps a competent historian will work out a careful account of the continuity of anti-Christian thought from the Ebionites and Celsus down to the present faculties of American theological seminaries. Such a work will effectually "outmode" the use of the somewhat inflated term "the modern mind" at least in its present theological context.

But it should also be noticed that the tactics of eighteenth century unbelief have been plagiarized as well as its theology. Claus Harms' 67th Thesis read: "It is a strange demand that there must be freedom to teach a new belief from a chair which the old faith has established and from a mouth which the old faith feeds. The Scripture is fulfilled 'He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.' Christians should be taught that they have the right *not* to suffer non-Christian and non-Lutheran teaching in pulpit and in school."[43] Calvin's Theological Academy was wholly in the hands of modernists at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Huguenot endowments had been perverted to anti-Christian ends as Puritan ones with us. In Francke's day the theological faculty at Halle was

a great Christian faculty as Andover's once was. In twenty-nine years it sent out 6,000 clergymen besides thousands educated in the Francke orphanage. Through the influence of Wolf and Semler, however, it was "captured" by the Enlightenment.

Later in the days of Gesenius and Wegscheider the holiest things of the Bible were held up to ridicule. Wegscheider proposed the question in his seminary one day whether Christianity ought to be altogether abolished to give way to a better religion. All present voted in the affirmative. Prof. Hengstenberg in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung* described the state of things at Halle. His exposure was denounced as an attempt to check the freedom of teaching. "The scientific results of modern investigation would be destroyed by such interference." The government insisted that theological chairs should be held only by those adhering to the Augsburg Confession. Yet by the familiar jockeying the two professors were retained. "The whole investigation and the sophistical, even dishonest character of the defense of the two professors," says Tischhauser, "makes on the impartial reader the most painful impression."[44]

When the evangelical Tholuck went to Halle in 1826 the faculty protested against his appointment. "I began my ministry there as a solitary on Patmos." Students and townspeople were incited against him as against a hypocrite. Haevernik, another evangelical, went to Rostock. The entire class left the room when he gave expression to his evangelical opinions. At Marburg the professor of dogmatics would read with the observation *ad futuram oblivionem* [to be forgotten] the paragraphs of his textbook which had to do with the person of Christ, justification by faith, the outpouring of the Spirit, etc. Gerok mentions a theological class at Tuebingen in 1834 all but three of whom denied the future life. In Jena professors made fun of the articles of religion which they had pledged themselves to teach. A Halle student testified that they diligently sought to root out all regard for the Bible and its contents; another that he had never in his course heard a quickening, edifying word

from those in theological chairs.* Kant was praised as a second Christ.[45]

Certainly Continental modernism had "captured" the theological schools. Liberal kleptomania is no new phenomenon.† And as evangelical Christians robbed of their seminaries are today establishing new ones in Chicago, Philadelphia, and elsewhere so those who had the good of the church at heart in the early nineteenth century started evangelical schools in Wittemberg and Herborn in 1817; in Gotha in 1834; in Friedberg and Wolfenbuettel in 1837 and at Heidelberg, Loccum, Hanover, and Berlin in 1838.[46]

Creedal obligations, explicit as well as implicit, were disregarded with as little scrupulousness then as now. Eighteenth century rationalists insisted with Semler that Jesus "accommodated" his statements to the ignorance and prejudices of the time. Why should not they do the same? When Paulus was made

*"Parents who sent their sons to the university to listen to such men as Semler, Thomasius, and Paulus had not the remotest idea that institutions of such renown for learning and religion were at the very time the hotbeds of rank infidelity. Even the state cabinets that controlled the professional chairs could not believe for a long time that men who had been chosen to teach theology were spending all their power in corrupting the religious sentiment of the land."—HURST, *History of Rationalism,* 251.

†Limitations of space forbid any consideration of present-day modernist intrigues on the mission field. They have, however, a certain analogy in the "capture" of the early nineteenth century Bible societies of the Continent. These were financed by unsuspecting Christians in England through the British and Foreign Bible Society and while refusing Scriptures to such apostolic servants of Christ as Neff, Pyt, and Bost, used the circulation of the Bible for Unitarian propaganda. This they did by writing heretical notes, by introducing the Apocrypha and even by inserting mis-translations. The purpose "of the Socinian party" according to Blumhardt of Basel, in binding up the Apocrypha with the Bible was "to obscure and lower the idea of inspiration." Fifty thousand copies of Bibles with the infidel preface of Prof. Haffner of Strassburg were sent out under the ægis of the British society before the *coup* was discovered. The Heidelberg rationalist Paulus was active in one Bible society, the persecuting liberals Levade, Curtat, and Chenevière in those of French Switzerland. Dean Curtat of the Lausanne Bible Society is remembered for his labored apology [in a theological essay] for card-playing on Sabbath evenings. His arguments were drawn from the silence of Christ and his apostles on the subject!—*Memoirs of James and Robert Haldane,* Ch. 20.

professor at Jena he expressed to his colleague Griesbach his perplexity because his theological convictions would not allow him to make the required statement of faith. Griesbach helped him out by saying that in the Confession one indeed expressed his esteem for the Reformation and that *one accepted these expressions in so far as they agreed with the true and reasonable content of the Bible.* "I promise that I will hold closely to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures as it is expressed in the Confession of our evangelical Lutheran church, that I will in no particular depart from it, to say nothing of opposing it." So swore the pastors of Bavaria. Those in Saxony took similar creedal obligations though hardly a dozen in the kingdom believed what they said.[47] How familiar the note in Reinhard's *System of Christian Morality*: "It is required of no one who takes his oath of office that he shall always hold for true that which he now holds for true. That would exclude all growth in religious knowledge." "When therefore we recite the creed our first care is not as to whether we believe each article according to the early interpretation, whether we are orthodox in our belief, but whether we express in our lives the belief that we speak." (Bishop William Lawrence, *Fifty Years,* 98.)

The Scriptures were played against the creed as if the latter were not a condensation of Scripture truth. "Protestantism," continues Reinhard, "recognizes only the Holy Scripture as norm of belief. Consequently the acceptance of the symbol is only so long to be understood as one is not convinced by other considerations." When in the Northern Baptist Convention at Indianapolis in 1922 an attempt was made to put on record the evangelical faith of Baptists the modernist Dr. Woelfkin substituted a general affirmation of adhesion to the New Testament for a statement of belief.[48] This was the old trick of rationalism. Those who scoffed at the historicity and doctrines of the New Testament asked the Prussian government to abolish confessions and make "the New Testament the sole standard of belief." So in England Blackburne's agitation culminated

in a petition to Parliament in 1772 asking for the substitution of a statement of belief in Scripture in place of subscription to the Articles. In this way 18th century free-thought sought to legitimatize itself in the Church of England.[49]

Some years ago there was a professor in the Boston University School of Theology whose teaching was of such a character that the students themselves complained and petitioned for relief. He was finally removed, passed to a Universalist theological school and was ultimately buried from the [Unitarian] King's Chapel, the minister declaring him a martyr "stoned by the church."* His autobiography, *For the Benefit of My Creditors,* is a publication of the [Unitarian] Beacon Press.

Prof. Mitchell signed the declaration required of all theological professors, of his sincere acceptance of the Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church [which includes the Apostles' Creed] to teach in harmony therewith. He also made the following statement to Bishop Andrews. On page 162 of

*Prof. Rauschenbusch also, we are told in the *Baptist,* was "stoned by the Junkers," although considering his theological opinions one cannot but think the indulgence accorded him as professor in a Christian institution more than ample. The free-thinker Bolingbroke, after remarking that he expects to be "treated with scorn and contempt by the whole theological tribe and railed at as an infidel," declares his purpose "to seek for genuine Christianity with the simplicity with which it is taught in the Gospel of Christ himself."—*Works,* Vol. 3, 330 and 339.

In stating the conditions on which he would assume the pastorate of the Rockefeller church Dr. Fosdick insisted that there should be no creedal conditions for membership. When the Rev. George Putnam installed another Mr. Fosdick over the [Unitarian] Hollis Street church two generations ago he said, "There is no other Christian body of which it is so impossible to tell where it begins and where it ends. We have no recognized principle by which any man who chooses to be a Christian disciple and desires to be numbered with us, whatever he believes or denies, can be excluded." The Hollis Street Church is long since dead and its building a theatre.

The German rationalist Tzschirner thought that "a Christian church might comprehend all opinions as paganism all classes of divinities." In the same spirit of comprehension Dr. Fosdick would include in the church all "men and women who give themselves with high spirit to human service in science or philanthropy but who never think of attributing their service of love to religious motives."—*Christianity and Progress,* 241.

his autobiography is published his interpretation explaining away the statement.

"I accept the Old Testament as divinely authoritative, recognizing a supernatural element manifested in miracles and prophecy.

"I accept the Gospel statement respecting Jesus' advent into the world. I believe in the Trinity including the deity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit.

"I believe that the death of Jesus was necessary for the salvation of mankind. I have not and never had any sympathy with the doctrines of Universalism."

"The first [statement] neither declares nor implies that the entire Old Testament is divinely authoritative.

"In the second I took care to say that I accepted the teachings of the Gospel, not the Apostles' Creed or any particular version but the concordant testimony of evangelical tradition which of course remained to be determined.

"The third did not commit me to any particular form of the doctrine of the Trinity.

"The fourth question was so indefinite that I might have answered in either the affirmative or the negative or in both ways.

"In my fifth statement I confined myself to the denial of the doctrine of retribution."

Of this trifler Prof. Sharp in a foreword to the autobiography says: "If Jesus had a brother and God a second son it was Hinckley Gilbert Mitchell."

Dr. Fosdick, in his farewell sermon at the First Presbyterian church, described himself as "a heretic." In the early church heretics "went out from us because they were not of us." The technique of the Enlightenment, both old and new is, as we have seen, very different. Dr. Fosdick's colleague at Union, Prof. Fagnani, writing *In Praise of Heresy,* says of heretics: "One who really cares for the church instead of resigning and withdrawing is conscientiously bound to remain in and bring as many of his brethren as possible around to his way of thinking," the church meanwhile paying his bills while he wrecks it. Dr. Rainsford urges young men to enter the Episcopal ministry, "to stay in it, and fight within to liberalize it." So David Hume was wont to urge men of free-thinking tendencies to take orders.[50] In 1815 Dr. Jeremiah Evarts writing in the *Panoplist* describes the method. "They [Unitarians] have clandestinely crept into orthodox churches by forbearing to

contradict their faith and then have gradually moulded them by their negative preaching to the shape which they would wish. The people after a while never hearing of the atonement nor of special grace or any of the kindred doctrines, forget that they belong to the Christian system and by and by regard a man as a kind of enthusiast or monster who preaches such doctrines. Who does not see that there is great cunning in all this? *But the honesty?"*

Just a century ago (1825) Prof. Clausen, a rationalist theologian of the University of Copenhagen, published a work of 800 pages in which he denied the Virgin Birth, the existence of evil spirits, the atonement and the divinity of Christ, quite in the style of modern Sadduceeism. The great Danish critic of the Enlightenment, N. S. F. Grundtvig, called him sharply to task with a clean-cut *aut-aut*. How familiar the words sound. "As an honest man he should either offer to the Christian church solemn apology for his un-Christian and offensive teaching or lay down his office and discard the Christian name."[51]

Eighty-eight theological students sent Clausen an address of congratulation as the five hundred buds of Mt. Holyoke College did to Dr. Fosdick. Clausen sued his critic for violation of academic freedom. The professor does not readily share "academic freedom" with others.

The rationalists of eighteenth century Germany altered the old liturgies to suit "modern views." Biblical expressions were removed and the Gospel gave place to moralizing commonplaces. "It makes a Christian blush," says Tischhauser, "to read the dry and wordy prayers substituted in a certain Schleswig-Holstein liturgy." The introduction of these liturgies caused protests which in some cases had to be repressed by military force.

The creed was in certain instances omitted from the baptismal formula and the words of institution from the communion. In the communion service one is represented as recovering self-respect. Children were baptized into the imitation of Jesus Christ, the great pattern of all virtue. Allusion to angels, the

coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the judgment were omitted. "They must not think that we laymen do not understand what is happening," wrote "a Schleswig-Holstein judge" in an anonymous pamphlet. "They explain away, philosophize away, ridicule away one mystery, one prophecy, one miracle after another, till only a 'religion of reason' is left. Formerly our Lord Jesus Christ and his atonement together with his teaching and example, were all. Now one hardly hears of him and his great work on earth is no longer named.

"Formerly preaching was in biblical language and according to the plain man's comprehension. Now in many passages they teach what Zollikofer, Beier, Bahrdt and the rest inspire whether it agrees with the Bible or not. Formerly nearly every priest had the confidence of his parish. Now there reigns in many parishes doubt and suspicion. Why are they so eager to introduce the [altered] service? Because with the formularies the doctrines are changed. Many doctrines which our fathers and we still hold as essential parts of the Lutheran belief are suppressed or mentioned in such a way that a plain Christian can with difficulty find them while *every Unitarian will accept with joy the collects and teaching of the* [*new*] *service.*"[52]

Bishop Neeley has described similar attempts to denature the ritual of the American Methodist Church [*The Revised Ritual of 1916*]. A commission on revision was appointed in 1912 which reported in 1916. Fortunately this report was turned over to the bishops by the General Convention at Saratoga in 1920 and many of the worst excisions were restored. But numerous significant mutilations still remain.

The Apostles' Creed was dropped from the service of baptism of those of riper years. Substituted therefor was the question, "Dost thou receive and profess the Christian faith as contained in the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ?"

In the form for receiving persons into the church the commission omitted the question, "Do you believe in the doctrines

of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Articles of the Methodist Episcopal Church?" This takes from the incoming members of the Methodist church any obligation to accept the articles of religion and it is done without any constitutional change, abrogation, or suspension of the said articles.

In place of the old question, "Have you saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ?" is substituted, "Do you receive and profess the Christian faith as contained in the New Testament?"

From the order of adult baptism is omitted, "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin and that which is born of the flesh is flesh and they that are in the flesh cannot please God but live in sin." This statement of the tainted nature of man is not pleasant for neo-Unitarians to read in church.*

*Dr. Harold Paul Sloan writes in *The New Infidelity and the New Reformation*, 25:

"Within six months in a preachers' meeting in the East a statement was made by a man of prominence in Methodism whose word would be generally accepted if we should publish his name, that twenty-five years ago a group of men met in Boston and agreed together to work for the liberalizing of the Methodist church. He pointed out that their procedure should be along four lines.

First, the putting of a chair of English Bible taught by a man of rationalist sympathy in the various colleges of Methodism.

Second, liberalizing the Book Concern.

Third, liberalizing of the ritual.

Fourth, liberalizing of the Course of Study.

Bishop Neeley intimates that this program is being worked out. He writes: "If a fraction of the current statements on this point are correct there is an anti-Methodist school of thought working through a few aggressive individuals to compel the church to accept its views and at the present time to accomplish this without constitutionally changing the Articles of Religion or other standards of doctrine. The method is not that of the open and frontal attack but of the sapper and miner.

"One way is to reach and mis-teach the more than four millions of children and young people in the Sunday-schools through Sunday-school literature. If they can do that for a few years, even five, they will indoctrinate these millions. The few who are manipulating these matters are strategists of no mean order and they mean if they can to revolutionize doctrinal Methodism. They are the reds inside the church.

"Another way is to produce and have spread with the imprint of the church publishing-house, denominational literature containing anti-Methodist teaching which the general and loyal membership will buy and read supposing that, as it comes from the church, it must be sound.

From the service for consecration of bishops after the *Veni Creator Spiritus* the expression is struck out "and the author of everlasting life," referring to Christ. Also from the prayer in the same passage, "thine only and dearly beloved son Jesus Christ," the word "only" as if to change the status which the church recognizes in Christ as the only-begotten son of God.

The old question to the bishops at ordination, "Are you ready with faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?" was cut out. Also the question, "Will you deny all ungodliness, etc., that the adversary may be ashamed, having nothing to say against you?" It is not good form in these circles to mention "the adversary" so out he goes from the Methodist ritual.

Eighteenth century modernists in Germany doctored catechisms, cutting out the new birth, the atoning work of Christ, and mangling quotations from Luther and the Bible. Mention has been made of Unitarian sun-worship. One of the eighteenth century German catechisms began with, "What is the first and best thing of all?" *Ans.* "The first and best thing of all is the sun." "What is the greatest and loftiest of all things?" *Ans.* "The starry heavens."[53] In another catechism the passage, "All Scripture is given by God" becomes, "Every book in which God's will is displayed" is inspired.

"Another way, but in the course of a few years a very influential way, is to slip into professors' chairs in various institutions men who both believe and promote anti-Methodist thought. In this way the school-men and educated classes are to be reached and the literary and scientific institutions will send out every year their hundreds of graduates, a more or less percentage of whom will spread the un-Methodist instruction they have received.

"Then as a way of controlling the incoming ministry the Course of Study is to be changed by throwing out sound and standard Methodist books and introducing those that cannot make true ministers.

"And now it looks like an effort to control the general membership and the congregations by a revised ritual.

"Nothing seems to have been overlooked by this little company of designers and if this goes on for a few years more the most disastrous consequences must follow."

For the ten commandments they substituted a modern code, "Do good for virtue's sake" and the like. It recalls Prof. G. H. Betts' "Ten Purposes," "I will respect and take care of my body," "I will take pride in work and thrift," and the rest. The *Shorter Bible* of Prof. Kent is no new invention. The old Enlightenment was as bent as the new on cutting out uncongenial doctrines from the Scriptures. Thus in 1790 was printed Schneider's *The Bible of the Old and New Testament in Extract According to Ethical Content.* Pastor Zerrener of Magdeburg issued a *Little School Bible for Children Adapted to the Needs of the Time and with the Elimination of All that is Objectionable* [i. e., miracles, etc.] In fact so many of these "shorter" Bibles were put into circulation that the Prussian government finally felt called to order that only complete Bibles should be used in the schools.[54]

Unitarian denaturizing of Christian hymns is an old game. I noticed lately in the refrain of "Till we meet again" that the original line "Till we meet at Jesus' feet" is metamorphosed into "Till we meet *in union sweet.*"[55] The eighteenth century Enlightenment also doctored hymnbooks. References to characteristic evangelical ideas were removed. When the Saxon hymnbook was published in 1793 the government expressly forbade doctrinal tampering. On Good Friday in a church near Greifswald it came to a wild tumult when the rationalist Hessian hymnbook was brought in and the excellent evangelical one excluded. In 1807 new and rationalist hymns were forced on the churches of Holland and their use made obligatory.

Under the lead of Pastor Sintenis of Magdeburg a union of rationalist clergymen not unlike the Modern Churchmen's League was organized taking the name of "The Friends of Light." Attempts to popularize the assured results of the Tuebingen criticism were undertaken. "Their advocates openly announced," quite in the manner of the American devotees of "Religious Education," "that the new critical opinions must conquer a place in home and school." "It is our duty to publish on the housetop what science has revealed to us. If oppo-

sition to Christianity is to be effectual it must descend from the heights of science to the ranks of the people." How the comparison between past and present modernisms covers at every point is seen by comparing Prof. Machen's *Christianity and Liberalism* with Prof. August Hahn's inaugural discussion in Leipzig University in 1827. Hahn shows that rationalism and Christianity were opposing opinions, that the rationalists could no longer call themselves Christians.[56]

Claus Harms' theses described the confusion which the modernism of his day had brought into church life.

"It brings confusion into the creeds which are nothing but clear universally accepted interpretations of the Holy Scripture; confusion into the authorized church services, hymnbooks, and catechisms to which the public preaching in many places is in sharp and dreadful opposition; confusion among teachers where one teaches the old and the other the new belief; confusion with other churches. Each is founded on the Bible with varying interpretations concerning which they have agreed to say 'You accept that interpretation and we this and so we can love and esteem each other.' But rationalists know no interpretation save that which each makes for himself and for the day."

It is hard for us of the twentieth century with its powerful evangelicism to realize how completely a Unitarian modernism had captured the churches of eighteenth century Europe. A believer in revelation could hardly be found among the Lutheran superintendents in North Germany. A statement of the consistory of Baden in 1799 remarked that most of the young candidates for the ministry showed strong tendency to dissolve Christianity into a mere naturalistic morality. Christianity was spoken of in the tone of Prof. Shotwell as "an outworn survival of the past whose complete disappearance from the face of the earth was greatly desirable." Serious proposals were made to transform the clergy into school-masters. When in 1811 a Dresden preacher of cultivation and talent dwelt, in an important city church, on the divinity of Christ there was universal surprise and in all the tea circles it was asked how a man

of such rare gifts could fall to such oddities. Pastor Pflaum in 1816 said [what Dr. Hilary Richardson has recently said of his Unitarian co-religionists in scathing terms] that for decades Protestants had ceased to concern themselves with the Bible. Also that many preachers were profoundly opposed to its study. When the evangelical Lindner was appointed to the chair of exegesis in Leipzig University he was described by the students as the sole representative of an orthodoxy which had been destroyed by science—a man clinging to a sinking wreck.[57]

In Norway, Bishop Bang tells us, "this rationalism had obtained a control the extent of which it is now difficult to form any conception. Taught in the University of Copenhagen where the Norwegian pastors were trained, preached from most pulpits, smuggled into the common schools and by papers and books into the villages, it moved as a plague over the whole spiritual life of the nation. Under its supposed 'enlightenment' the darkness was so great that daylight seemed gone forever."[58]

Wilhelm Beck was the son of a leading Danish pastor, an upright man. "But," he tells us in his *Memoirs,* "of Christianity there was no trace in our home,—no prayer, no hymns, no talk about the things of God's kingdom. I never learnt to pray as a child." This man, who later renewed the religious life of Denmark, was in his university days an unbeliever and Christ-denier; *also a student for the ministry.* Rationalist priests preached to empty churches and the week was spent in drinking and dancing. Beck's fellow-theological students "swore like butchers, were passionate card-players and veritable dance-horses in the exclusive balls of Copenhagen. From the professors we received no Christian impulses for the awakening of the real life of faith."[59]

The English church was drenched with rationalism although it was giving the world some of the greatest apologists of Christianity, Clarke, Waterland, Butler, Warburton and Paley. Its spiritual life was at the lowest ebb. This period was also "the midnight of the Church of Scotland." Scotch "Moderatism" bore a strong family resemblance to American modern-

ism. Hugh Miller in his famous defense of Christian missions before the General Assembly described it as *"an infidelity that purported to be anti-Christian on Bible authority.* While it robed itself in the habiliments of unbelief it took the liberty of lacing them with Scripture edgings."[60] Very many of the clergy were Unitarian, for the infidelity of Hume and Adam Smith, after infecting the universities, had passed into the ministry. Catechisms along Socinian [i.e., Unitarian] lines were printed and used in schools. "The dead chill of Socinianism rested on the Presbyterianism of the North of Ireland" and non-conformist minister there was practically synonymous with Unitarian. In Geneva the successors of Calvin were regarded by the French Encyclopædists as allies. In 1825 Ami Bost wrote:

"For more than thirty years the ministers who have gone out of our schools of theology to serve either the churches of our land or of France have not received one single lecture on the truths which exclusively belong to revelation, such as the redemption of mankind by the death of Christ, the justification of the sinner by faith, the corruption of our nature, the divinity of our Saviour. In theology we were taught nothing but the dogmas of natural religion. The extent to which this practical incredulity was carried is clear from this fact, elsewhere unheard of in the annals of the Protestant churches, that excepting for a lecture in the Hebrew language when the Bible was used simply as a Hebrew textbook and not for anything it contained, the Word of God was never used throughout our course; in particular the New Testament never appeared either as a language book or for any other purpose. There was no need of the New Testament whatever in order to complete our four years course in theology."[61]

The completeness of the victory which modernism had won over the Christian faith is clear from its persecution of it. "Toleration" was the peculiar virtue which the Enlightenment emphasized but it was not toleration for evangelical Christianity. Those who distributed tracts or held prayer-meetings or gave away Bibles were constantly persecuted by the liberals.

Especially vindictive was the general superintendent Roehr in Goethe's Weimar who "as a spider from the middle of his web, watched the least movement at its edge for some traveling Wuppertal student giving out tracts." A correspondent in the rationalist *Allg. Kirchenzeitung* reported conversation with a peasant who attended cottage meetings.

"Why," he asked, "do the clergy rave against us when they are silent regarding the sins of their fellow worldlings to which they give their approval in word and deed. We know that the church is full of men who describe the Bible as fable, deny that man is made in God's image, deny that this image must be renewed, that man is fallen. From the universities we can look for no other pastors than these, infected with this poison. Therefore unlettered people in city and country who hold to God's Word have services among themselves with Bible and old evangelical sermon books. As a consequence we suffer much secret persecution and abuse from parsons and people who call themselves 'enlightened.' These set detectives on us and the like."

To some this persecution became so unendurable that they left their homes to seek elsewhere the right to worship as conscience dictated. The Kornthal and Wilhelmsdorf colonies were made up of those who would not use the rationalist liturgy of Wuertemburg and the original South Russian colonies of Swabian pietiests consisted of men who left Germany for the same reason. Out of this emigration came the great Stundist or evangelical movement of modern Russia.[62] A vivid chapter for a History of Liberal Intolerance could be made up of the persecutions to which the Christian Reformed seceders from the state church of Holland were subjected at the hands of early nineteenth century Dutch modernists.*

In Norway Hauge was imprisoned nine times before his last terrible ten-year imprisonment at the hands of Norwegian

*In Holland these separatists who had left the state church because of its Unitarianism were at the instance of the synod prosecuted by the government. A clause of the Code Napoleon which forbade the assembly of more than twenty persons for worship without consent of the author-

liberals. These last made no attempt to alleviate his prison sufferings but they provided him with Voltaire's works in the hope of breaking down his faith in evangelical Christianity. His followers were tracked and jailed. Meetings were broken up. Evangelicals coming to the communion were driven away by liberal priests, horsewhip in hand. People were arrested for merely reading Hauge's writings. Finally the government at the instance of the modernist party ordered the surrender of all copies. "I have talked with old people," relates Bishop Bang, "who told me what an impression the command to surrender Hauge's books made upon them; how many, as the old martyrs, preferred punishment to letting go these precious books which had been such a blessing to them: how they secreted them in garrets and cellars and read them unobserved."[63] All this happened at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the full blaze of the Enlightenment after a generation of liberal theology had shaped and controlled the churches of Scandinavia. In Sweden liberal fanatics like Bishop Wingård subjected the Schartauan preachers, who were recreating West Swedish religious and moral life, to constant persecution, persecution to which, as Schartau's biographer tells us, a strikingly large number succumbed in early life.

In 1799 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland *by unanimous vote* prohibited all persons from preaching in any place under their jurisdiction unless licensed. The interpellation which led to this vote described the evangelical preachers [and

ities gave the necessary pretext for the persecution. Even in the middle of the last century the rationalist clergy of the Danish state church locked the churches against the revival. The people were driven into the woods only finally to build more than four hundred mission houses. The Inner Mission of Baden has just published (1924) a report on the occasion of its 75th jubilee. It states that in 1830 when "a watery and unbiblical catechism" was introduced only seven clergymen could be found in the whole electorate to protest against it and when as late as 1848 Pastor Nein in an assembly of seventy-one clergymen affirmed his belief in the divinity of Christ he was greeted with protests and laughter. In 1824 the Baden synod drew up a resolution asking the state to proceed against "pietists" and prevent them from holding meetings. But the Grand Duke Leopold refused. The state church of Baden is today predominatingly evangelical.

the boorishness is accentuated by the fact that the Haldanes were of the best family connections in Scotland] as "vagrant teachers" and classed "Sunday schools, irreligion, and anarchy" in a common denunciation.

The procurator of the church was authorized to proceed legally against teachers of Sunday schools on the strength of some obsolete Act of the Scottish parliament. It was not due to "the Moderates," to the Blairs and Carlyles and Moodies and Hills, that there was not actual persecution. Dr. Hugh Blair who instigated this action was the friend of Hume and other unbelieving philosophers. Even the Relief Synod, quite in the spirit of the present-day Hobens and Mathewses, decreed "that no minister shall give or allow his pulpit to be given to any person who has not attended a regular course of philosophy and divinity in some of the universities of the nation."[64]

This action called out by the great Christian revival associated with the Haldanes was duplicated soon after Robert Haldane began his ministry in Geneva. By the Reglement of May 3, 1817, theological students before they could be ordained were obliged to sign certain articles which committed them *not* to preach the fundamental Christian doctrines—the deity of Christ, original sin, the doctrine of grace, etc. M. Pyt and M. Guers, two students, when ordered to state their faith did so in the language of the venerable confession of the French church to which so many Huguenot martyrs had sealed their adhesion with blood. The professor declared this evangelical creed enough to make "brigands." They were denied ordination and with Gonthier, Bost, Empeytaz, Porchat, l'Huillier and others driven out of the church. The saintly Malan was deprived of his ministerial and academic offices. D'Aubigne was sent out of Switzerland; Gaussen deposed. Du Vivier, preaching in the Oratory of Carouge, asserted the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the atonement. The Venerable Company [the ministerial association of Geneva] denounced this teaching as "scandalous" and ordered that no student should henceforth be allowed to preach unless his discourse had been submitted

to three professors, one of them the persecuting rationalist Prof. Chenevière. When Haldane went to the French seminary city of Montauban the Socinians sought the help of the French government against him but this was refused.[65]

Twentieth century modernism confines itself to intrigue. It is not powerful enough to persecute. Yet the spirit of intolerance is not wanting. "One of the radical leaders warned me," says Dr. Massee, "that it was their purpose, having captured the schools and trained their leadership, having captured the denominational machinery and controlled its officials, to make it impossible for a conservative theologian or minister to preach in the Northern Baptist Convention." One rationalist of eighteenth century Germany, insisting that *the true path of theological education should pass through philosophy to the Bible,* adds, "What in the world can we expect of a great part of the future clergy when many theological students reverse this order and use, as key to the Scriptures, tracts from Basel." He urges the theological professors to intensify their examinations so that these evangelical students may fail to pass and so be kept out of the ministry. Others suggest that students with these convictions be sent to the foreign field [where fevers do their work]. How little different the spirit of the *Christian Century* of Chicago when writing of the Moody Bible Institute, or of Prof. Bacon in his address at the centennial anniversary of the founding of the Yale Divinity School, railing at "Bible institutes and similar organizations which are turning out practitioners by the wholesale. . . . Wild-cat institutions . . . theological charlatanism victimizing a helpless public by pretensions on which no competent authority has passed . . . vampires that prey upon the weakness of the human soul."

To the triumph of modernism corresponded the collapse of popular morality. The churches of Germany were empty; the services largely omitted. In Mecklenburg the great majority of the clergy were liberals. They had largely given up holding funeral services. The dead were registered by them, fees were paid, names entered in the church books but prayer and funeral

addresses omitted. Apparently they had no Christian comfort to offer, for "the philosophy of the death-bed is not that of the university." The six newspapers of Hamburg were constantly attacking pietism and defending paganism and suicide. Indecent matter was freely printed in them. "What a negative period it is," remarked one of the time. "Everybody steals; nobody gives. Everybody destroys; none builds. There is no earnestness; all is frivolity; no dignity, no purpose." Peasants would travel long distances to take the communion from pastors who lived more decently than their own. When Stier was a country pastor he was surrounded by rationalist clergy in all the neighboring parishes. A number of them gathered to celebrate the communion. After dinner the time was spent in reading vulgar anecdotes. When Stier suggested other reading on so serious an occasion the answer was loud laughter. He took his hat and left.[66]

"Perhaps never since there was an evangelical church," writes Tischhauser, "was the churchly and religious and moral life so low. Never such looseness in morals, never so widely current a spirit of despair. Everything positive in religious belief and practise was in solution and the foundations of the church were shaken to the depths. In 1786 Nicolai declared that in twenty years the name of Jesus would cease to be mentioned in a religious way. Fichte publicly asserted that in five years there would be no more Christian religion and that his generation was corrupt to the marrow. Arndt charged the leaders of the time who thought themselves to be giving men the purest religion with taking religion from them altogether. Emphasis on morality without regard to Christ's grace had produced demoralization. The Kantian categorical imperative had made a complete fiasco in the life of the German people."[67]

When the situation seemed darkest the Spirit of God began awakening souls. John Wesley felt his heart strangely warmed in the Aldersgate meeting. Hans Nielsen Hauge, plowing on a bright April day, was suddenly taken with an uplifting to God "that nothing in the world seemed worthy of further

interest." From that hour onward his life was dedicated to the re-Christianization of the Norwegian people. Schartau and later Rosenius did a similar work for Sweden.[68] James and Robert Haldane devoted their wealth and brilliant gifts to the revival of the Christian life of Scotland. The *Revéil* broke out in Switzerland and France. Devout and powerful personalities were raised up to proclaim the Gospel of grace in the Protestant churches of the French tongue—César Malan, Gaussen, d'Aubigne, Ami Bost, Felix Neff the apostle to the high Alps, Henri Pyt the apostle to the Pyrenees and Béarn, de Gasparin, Vinet, Adolph Monod. In Holland Bilderdyke, Da Costa, Capadose, Groen van Prinsterer restored the evangelical church and school. Dr. A. Kuyper, who took the torch as it fell from van Prinsterer's hand, was himself trained in the Leyden classroom of the rationalist Scholten but was converted to Christ through the testimony of an humble woman in the village in which he was parson.[69] If ever a man could be described as a fundamentalist it was Dr. Kuyper, the mightiest and most exquisitely cultivated intellect of nineteenth century Holland.

The three hundredth anniversary of the posting of the Theses by Luther turned the attention of the German clergy to the great reformation doctrine of free grace. They began searching the Scriptures. Claus Harms' *Ninety-Five Theses for the New Time* came as a trumpet peal. "Reason is," he cried, "the Pope of our time. It has not been sufficiently investigated how it happens that the religion of reason was so lately discovered. It is as if Reason came belated into the world." Dr. Fosdick calls his rococo-period theology "the New Reformation." The phrase is as old as the theology. "With the idea of a Progressive Reformation, as the idea is conceived," said Harms in his third thesis, *"Lutheranism is reformed into heathenism and Christianity is reformed out of the world."* The new reformation came rather with the revival of the Reformation doctrines, the new interest in the great Pauline affirmations.[70]

These were preached with power by Jaenicke and F. Strauss in Berlin, by Rautenberg in Hamburg, by Boos and Gossner in Bavaria, by Henhoefer in Baden, by the brothers Hofacker in Stuttgart, by Krummacher in the Wuppertal, by the von Belows in Pommerania. Men of learning and spiritual wisdom were now to be found in the theological chairs—Neander, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Julius Mueller, Rothe, Lange, Olshausen, Stier and Luthardt. J. C. G. Kraft, professor in Erlangen, was wont to open his lectures with prayer and a formal confession of his belief won through an intimate experience of sin and grace. Tholuck, Rothe, and Stier owed their impulse to the new life to Baron von Kottwitz, a converted worldling, who became a sort of German Wilberforce to the slaves of poverty of Berlin.

All over Germany the breath of the Spirit moved men. Revivals broke out at the same time and in wholly unrelated places. Among the most notable was that at Moettlingen where J. C. Blumhardt preached, accompanied as it was by remarkable miracles of cure and exorcism. To the church at Stuttgart, where L. Hofacker preached, people came in streams, often from long distances on foot. The visible effect of his preaching is described as of wind billowing a field of grain. "My whole purpose is to drive a wedge into consciences," he said. "The church has become pagan. It needs preaching that will start it out of sleep." Russworm, a converted modernist wrote on current plans for raising attendance. "Neither more ritual nor better endowments nor greater intellectual equipment of the clergy can do anything but only the Gospel, 'God so loved the world.'" He then speaks of what the Gospel had done for him.

"I thank my God that the scales have fallen from my eyes, that I have come to recognize myself as a lost sinner by nature and Jesus Christ as the true Son of God and my Saviour. For forty years I lay in darkness and unbelief. I saw in him who says, 'I am the first and the last and behold I am alive for evermore' only a man who deserved no more regard than

Plato or Seneca. But with weeping heart I now cry, 'Forgive me, my Saviour, I knew not what I did.' "[71]

With the Revival came an outburst of joyous song as at the Reformation. The Enlightenment had emasculated the hymns of the church. Original contributions either Christian or permanent in quality it had none to make. But the reaffirmation of the good tidings awakened the singers as the sunrise the birds. Charles Wesley, John Newton, Perronet, H. W. Lyte, Heber, Keble, J. M. Neal, Horatius Bonar, Alford, Sir Henry Baker, filled the English nineteenth century with joyous testimony. In Scandinavia Grundtvig and Ingemann and Wallin and Hartmann and Weyse and Lindeman led the awakened church in song; in Germany Gerok and Knapp and Spitta and Ernst Moritz Arndt. The mutilated German hymns of the earlier times were restored through the care of Bunsen, Stier, and Claus Harms.

And with a revival of adoration went hand in hand a revival of good works. The old Enlightenment was strikingly like the present Enlightenment in its merely sentimental interest in human suffering.* It knew nothing of personal self-sacrifice for others. It talked with Schiller of *"die Millionen"* as its present-day representatives of "the masses" but did little for them,

*In summing up the "practical results of the Enlightenment" all that Troeltsch can find to its credit are certain educational reforms. There is a thoroughly characteristic note in his words: *"The folk schools which pietism had brought into being* were seized with the spirit of the Enlightenment."

Basedow, the educational reformer of the Enlightenment, was the spiritual grandfather of a family of American religious educationalists of truly Mormon proportions. "Human nature was regarded by him as a germinating seed in which a good and noble impulse dwells, requiring only fostering care. A prime object with him was to build chiefly on the conception of the dignity of human nature." Here we have the Religious Education Association *in ovo.* Miss Ethel Cutler, a secretary of the National Y. M. C. A. tells us that "the final aim of Bible study, *as Prof. Kent has said,* is to make efficient citizens." R.E. 7:707. This was the Enlightenment's mark of the high calling. "Instead of hearing what the grace of God can effect in the soul people heard what their duties to their neighbors were, what would render them useful citizens."

The French Revolution was affected by the liberal theologians then as the Bolshevist Revolution in the mildly bourgeois office of the

exhausting itself in writing. "Its ideal love of Patagonian and Iroquois," says Hagenbach, "took the place of practical love of neighbor."[72] But with the Revival came a great efflorescence of practical charity.

The English antislavery movement was the creation of such evangelicals as Wilberforce, Clarkson, Zachary Macauley and Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. Elizabeth Fry on her conversion took up the ministry of John Howard. The evangelical Lord Shaftesbury is as prominent a figure in nineteenth century evangelicism as his sneering forbear in eighteenth century free thought. His labors for better housing, better care of the insane and factory reform put him at the front in the history of social reform. Chalmers pioneered district charity relief in Glasgow and Edinburgh and the Christian layman van der Heydt codified Chalmers' experience, so to speak, in the Elberfeld system. Thomas Guthrie worked for poor boys, for cripples and in temperance reform. F. J. Barnado abandoned his proposed career in foreign missions to spend his life in the rescue of waifs. In forty years 59,384 children passed through his homes. George Muller in his lifetime cared for about ten thousand children in the Bristol orphanages. Quarrier, the Scotch Barnado, has worked with great success on the same lines.

This type of charity in Germany was pioneered by J. D. Falk. He describes himself in his early years as "one of those who think that when they sit at the writing desk the world is helped thereby. It was a great grace of God that instead of working me up for writing paper He used me as lint and laid me in the open sores of the time." Falk placed destitute boys in homes—a sort of German C. R. Brace. Christian Heinrich Zeller opened a school for poor boys and indigent school teachers at Beuggen in Switzerland. Over the entrance was written, "Built on the foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ

Christian Century, and one cannot but think with a smile of Messrs. Morrison and Willett when he reads that the liberal parsons of the Rhineland were wont to appear in Jacobin caps in the revolutionary days.—TISCHHAUSER, *Geschichte d. Evang. Kirche Deutschlands,* 138.

being the chief corner-stone." Pestalozzi, one of the few philanthropists of the Enlightenment, after the failure of his institution at Neuhoff, visited him and broke out with, "This is just what I *wanted* to do."

Amalie Sieveking, educated in rationalism, "laid all other books aside and gave herself wholly to the Bible and the Lord let me be found of Him." She pioneered charity and nursing in Hamburg. In Berlin Gossner organized a men's union for providing night watchers for the sick poor with five thousand paying members and thirty-eight employed nurses; also a women's union of the same character out of which grew the Elizabeth Hospital. Fliedner, passing from rationalism to biblical Christianity, founded the first German union for prison reform, working especially among discharged women prisoners. The great Kaiserswerth deaconess enterprise which now numbers its nurses by the tens of thousands, was begun in 1836. Fliedner demanded personal religious experience as the first qualification for the deaconess life. Wilhelm Loehe in 1853 founded similar work at Neuendettelsau in Bavaria with a department for training male nurses at Polsingen. "The Paris Deaconess Institution, as most of the good works of Parisian Protestantism," says Georges Appia,* "is related through its founders to the period of the Revival. Intense piety, love for Christ, practical proof of this by love for the brethren, especially the disinherited everywhere—the atmosphere which one breathed in this House was indeed that of the Revival."[73] Besides its Motherhouse with its asylums, houses of refuge, etc., it directs twelve other enterprises in Paris and the *banlieue* and fifteen in various parts of France—hospitals, rest-houses, orphanages, asylums, etc. So, too, that at Ersta [Stockholm]. To the evangelist Rosenius and his evangelical associates it owed its origin. Begun in poverty and dependence on God for supply of actual necessities it has grown to a noble constellation of institutions. Its sisters work all over Sweden as district

*Brother to Dr. L. Appia, a devout evangelical, who with Henri Dunant founded the Red Cross Society.

nurses, church nurses, nurses in poor houses, hospitals, asylums. Its history is inseparably bound up with the life of the evangelical saint Dr. Bring.[74] One should also in this connection mention Cathinka Guldberg who trained in her lifetime 1,400 deaconesses in the Deaconess Home in Christiania; also Dr. W. A. Passavant, who in the eighteen forties transplanted the deaconess idea to Pittsburg and himself collected from a poor immigrant church an endowment of over a million dollars, thus throwing absolutely in the shade the tenuous charitable efforts of the Enlightenment in Boston.

J. H. Wichern, as so many, received his religious impulse from Baron von Kottwitz, who spent and was spent in establishing workshops for the unemployed in Berlin. The Rauhe Haus was a work of rescue and education of boys carried on in the spirit of Christ. This ministry, however, was the prologue to the greater work of the Inner Mission of which Wichern was the founder. This philanthropy has grown to stately proportions, embracing the greatest variety of institutions—schools, asylums, orphanages, crĕches, rescue homes, inebriate homes, etc. The statistics for 1924 give the magnificent total of 3,855 institutions! German Evangelicism in our day has given the world the greatest philanthropist of modern times in the person of Pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh. Bethel-Bielefeld has stretched its hands out in relief to all forms of sickness and misery although its great special work is among epileptics.

Among other developments of Bodelschwingh's ministry has been an extensive system of inns for out-of-works which complements the *Herberge zur Heimat* [home inns] founded by an earlier Christian of the Revival, Clemens Perthes of Bonn. The French colony of mercy is at La Force [Dordogne], the Asiles John Bost, a large complex of homes for epileptics, consumptives, etc. Bost was converted when going up the steps of the Paris Opera as distinctly as Luther on the Sancta Scala and one result of his conversion was this beautiful charity at La Force.

Hauge's preaching in Norway was followed by a remarkable economic expansion, his followers founding mills and trading concerns and other enterprises as he had during his life time. Oberlin at the same time was putting piety into practise in the Ban de la Roche, not at all in the meanwhile losing his interest in Bible societies and foreign missions. In Denmark Grundtvig while fighting modernism started Folk High Schools for the education of country boys, which have proved extraordinarily successful. Hans Knudsen, invalided home from his mission in India, began work among the cripples of Copenhagen, caring for their orthopedic needs and industrial training. By 1886 his society had taken care of more than 1,500 cripples. The remarkable parish relief system in Copenhagen, the paradigm for all such work, is recognized as a fruit of the evangelist Beck's ministry as also Th. Hansen's *Stefaniförening* and the Magdalene Home of Thora Esche. To the last class of social wreckage the Dutch pastor Heldring devoted his life, his Home at Steenbeck in Holland being the model for the world. Josephine Butler's brave fight against the traffic in girls should be recalled in this connection and the work of Mrs. Bramwell Booth. The Salvation Army with all its Samaritan enterprises is an extension of Methodism and it was the Methodist revival which broke the grip of the Enlightenment on England.

In 1821 Prof. J. S. C. Schweiger, a chemist of Halle, founded the *Verein zur Verbreitung von Naturkenntniss,* nothing less than a missionary society for the teaching of mathematics and physical sciences to backward lands such as China, Japan, and India. He wrote to Goethe for counsel and endorsement and *after a year of waiting* received the following reply:

"Accept the assurance of my sincere sympathy and a contribution to your praiseworthy undertaking to which I beg for a closer relation. Commend me to all connected with it and consider me as one who will never forget science and her friends." The contribution was two Friedrich d'or! So much

at least was the monarch of the Enlightenment ready to contribute for *"mehr Licht"* in darkest Asia.

This missionary society is the only one of its kind that has yet reported itself and its life seems to have been of short duration. It is indeed amazing that the modern world with all its resources of wealth and knowledge has never made any systematic attempt to "teach all nations." So utterly lacking, in the last analysis, is this modern world in altruism.

The liberal theology from 1700 down to 1925 has shown the same self-centered spirit. Never has it initiated any mission of importance,—religious, educational, or medical.* But with the evangelical revival came the greatest voluntary movement which the world has yet seen, a movement which steadily grows from decade to decade and the final purpose of which is to put an evangelized world at the feet of the returning Christ. The Bible Societies, the Church Missionary Society, the Rhenish, Basel, Leipzig, Berlin, and other German societies, the American Board, the Société Evangélique de Paris, the great Wesleyan societies, the Scotch missions, the London Missionary Society, the China Inland Mission and literally scores of other great organizations sprang up like good seed of the kingdom in the evangelical springtime which followed eighteenth century rationalism.

The old rationalism is under a new name rearing its head again. It is aiming at nothing less than the perversion of the entire institutional life of American Christianity. It has up to the present worked quietly and its successes have been both notable and shameful. They may be still more remarkable in the near future. But only for a time. Those who are disconcerted and alarmed by this unlooked-for development will find reassurance in the history of the Christian renascence which followed the eighteenth century. Prof. Troeltsch has to record that "the English, Swiss and German revival period created in the

*The Enlightenment "captured" the Danish Tranquebar mission in India from its evangelical founders but could not secure missionaries to carry it on and was obliged to relinquish it to the Leipzig mission.

Protestant churches *a mighty counter-current which ended with the complete expulsion of the Enlightenment Theology"* (Art. *Aufklaerung Realencyclopaedie f. Prot. Theologie u. Kirche*). So will it be with us. When the outlook seems most discouraging we are to look for great manifestations of God's power.

" . . . O Wind,
If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?"

REFERENCES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. *The Quest*, 9. 2. Hagenbach, *German Rationalism*, 95. 3. *O. T. in Light*, 188. 4. *Works*, 4:463. 5. *Id.* 4:328. 6. *Creative Christianity*, 36. 7. *Modern Use*, 122. 8. Leland, *Deistical Writers*, 1:153. 9. *The Fundamental Beliefs of Christianity*, 83. 10. *Modern Use*, 164. 11. *Prophet of Nazareth*, 215. 12. Quoted in Sykes, *State of the Controversy*, 48, 214. 13. *Life and Teachings of Jesus*, 236. 14. *Modern Use*, 105. 15. *Age of Reason*, 39. 16. *Confessions of an Old Priest*, 33. 17. Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, 331. 18. *Modern Use*, 185. 19. Strauss, *The Old Faith and the New*, 211-213. 20. *Id.* 124. 21. *Id.* 160. 22. *Id.* 102. 23. *Modern Use*, 105. 24. Clarke, *Sixty Years with the Bible*, 142. 25. *Letters of Certain Jews*, 373. 26. Strauss, *op. cit.* 165. 27. *Atlantic*, Aug., 1924. 28. Strauss, *op. cit.* 44. 29. Shaftesbury, *Characteristics*, 1:18, 19. 30. Chubb, *Posthumous Works*, 2:40. 31. *Foundations of Christian Belief*, 196. 32. Shaftesbury, *op. cit.* 3:315. 33. Strauss, *op. cit.* 9. 34. *Works*, 4:290, 294. 35. Tischhauser, *Gesch. d. Evang. Kirche Deutschlands*, 109. 36. F. G. Lewis, *How the Bible Grew*, ix. 37. *Letters of Certain Jews*, 330, 458. 38. W. N. Clarke, *op. cit.* 255. 39. Annet, *The Resurrection of Christ Considered*, 72. 40. Tischhauser, 609. 41. C.R. 1914:581. 42. *The New Knowledge and the Christian Faith*, 15, 19. 43. Tischhauser, 347. 44. *Id.* 624-27. 45. *Id.* 457, 467, 469, 147-8. 46. *Id.* 474. 47. *Id.* 157, 476-7. 48. *Id.* 153, 497. 49. L. Stephen, *History of English Thought*, 1:424. 50. Rainsford, *Story of a Varied Life*, 339; L. Stephen, *op. cit.* 1:375. 51. Grundtvig, *Kirkens Gjenmaele*, Introduction. 52. Koch, *Oplysningstid i den Danske Kirke*, 242. 53. Tischhauser, *op. cit.* 177. 54. *Id.* 198-9. 55. *Boston Herald*, April 1, 1925. 56. Tischhauser, 604. 57. *Id.* 349, 151, 190, 202, 266. 58. Chr. Bang, *H. N. Hauge og hans Samtid.* 59. Beck, *Erindringer fra mit Liv*, 11, 16. 60. *Memoirs of James and Robert Haldane*, 125-6. 61. Quoted in Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, 426; Tischhauser, 416-17. 62. Ziegler, Wilhelmsdorf, 26-27. 63. Ch. Bang, H. N. Hauge, *passim*. 64. *Memoirs of J. and R. Haldane*, 234-39. 65. *Id.* 400-417. 66. Tischhauser, 605, 120, 127, 442. 67. *Id.* 125-6, 269. 68. V. Södergren, *Schartau.* 69. Rolfhaus, *Dr. A. Kuyper*, 20. 70. Tischhauser, 337, 343. 71. *Id.* 393. 72. *German Rationalism*, 189. 73. Georges Appia, 2:263, 265. 74. Minneskrift t. Sv. Diakonissenanstaltens Femtiårs Jubilaeum.

APPENDIX

THE WILL AND THE FORUM

Daniel Sharp Ford, publisher of the *Youth's Companion,* left by will to the Boston Baptist Social Union the sum of $350,000 for the erection of a Baptist Church House, the Ford Building, with auditorium; and as much more for city mission work in Boston. A tablet, which every one entering Ford Hall passes, expresses in the words of this will Mr. Ford's "desire and hope that these gifts . . . should stimulate the religious interest" of the Social Union members "in promoting the welfare of wage-workers *through distinctly Christian agencies.*"

What Mr. Ford meant by this is clear from his activities in life and from the terms of his will. He had generously backed the Ruggles Street church in its evangelistic and philanthropic services to the poor community in which it was situated. His will provided for the continuance of these benefactions at the same place as long as the majority of the members of the Ruggles Street church *"should believe in or hold to the religious tenets held by the Baptist denomination."* A chief purpose of the bequest was to draw "Christian business men into closer personal relation" with wage-workers . . . "in friendly association and in helpful acts *and above all in seeking to bring them to accept Christ and Christ's teachings as the guides of their life.*" "To this end," he adds, "I have made these bequests."

Under the terms of this will the Ford Hall Forum was instituted to which was granted the free use of Ford Hall auditorium and considerable subsidies for payment of speakers.

The speaker who has appeared most frequently on this platform has been Charles Zeublin. Mr. Zeublin died recently.

His original Methodism had so far evaporated during his career at Chicago University as to leave him without hope of a life to come. "I do not know when my redeemer will live or whose redeemer I may be except in the sense that every man is our redeemer. . . . The redemption of the people will be by means of impersonal immortality, the crux of democratic religion." (*The Religion of a Democrat.*) Dr. John Haynes Holmes, the next most frequent speaker, is more lucid. His addresses are aimed, as he tells us (*Religion for Today*), to turn men "from the old religion to the new," that is, away from what Mr. Ford believed to what he abhorred. "The doctrines . . . which make up the content of Christian tradition," he goes on to tell us, "are simply not true. They have all been refuted a thousand times. They are ignored in our schools and colleges and laughed at in our newspapers. . . . The church is disloyal to truth; she is engaged in the business of falsehood and deceit. . . . God if he is to be found anywhere must be found in the heart and mind of humanity," 47 and 65.

"What wonder," says this forum star, "that there have been men who have soberly declared that Christianity has been more of a curse than a blessing to the human race and that if every church could be closed today and every pulpit left forever empty humanity would gain immeasurably more than she would lose," 35.

I suppose one could hardly find a more representative collection of anti-Christian radicals than has appeared on the roster of speakers at this forum during the past fifteen years. The free-thinker Stanton Coit, the unfrocked Dr. Crapsey, President Morgan of Antioch College, Prof. Schmidt dismissed from the Colgate Baptist seminary, the revolutionary Bouck White, the Unitarian *matadore* Dr. Dieffenbach, rabbis to talk about the Jewishness of Jesus and the Bible as literature, Unitarians—Cummings, Rihbany, Slicer, and the atheist Cooke. Even the church-critic McAffee has been brought up from New York to answer the query, "Is religion failing in America?"; also Mr. Villard, the good friend of the Bolshevists. Lately we

have had Rabbi Wise and his son, James W. Wise, the latter to tell what young people are thinking of religion. "Liberal Judaism" explains this representative of Jewish unbelief, "affirms unhestitatingly that God does exist, that all depends on his existence and that there is and must be a life after death. *And then it wonders why it fails to hold the youth of today with its teachings.*" One enthusiastic Unitarian, Dr. Wiers, feels that the forum may possibly "mark the birth of *a new religion.*" *(Democracy in the Making.)*

However that it may be it is surely impossible to find in Mr. Ford's will or known interests and religious views anything which would justify the staging of this troupe of *freigeister.*

THE MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME COURT AND THE ANDOVER CASE

The Supreme Court of Massachusetts has enjoined the trustees of Andover and the president and fellows of Harvard in a decision which constitutes a stinging rebuke to all who have had part in betraying Andover to Harvard Unitarianism. This decision would seem to provide precedents for proceeding against the perversion of the Daniel Sharp Ford fund.

"An owner of property," says the court, "may give it upon trust to maintain and inculcate any doctrine of Christianity or to promote and extend any particular Christian denomination. . . . *The obligation is imposed upon the managers of such a charity to adhere strictly to the scheme of the founders. Those who administer the charity have no right to vary, alter, or change its plan. They must execute the purposes of the founders conformably to its true intent. Their ideas of expediency or general utility in conducting the trust are of no consequence. The court in ascertaining the purpose of the founders of charitable trusts and in performing its duty to see that they are not perverted has no concern with the degree of public advantage likely to flow from the trust as founded as compared with some other more or less analogous purpose.*

"In applying these principles to a charity established for the training of ministers of religion manifestly not the slightest consideration can be given to the present prevalence of the religious creeds or doctrines to be taught or to our own beliefs concerning them.

"An undenominational theological school was foreign to the purpose of the founders and alien to their declarations. . . . Those original donors were resolute in their determination to combat liberal religious thought among Congregationalists. . . . It is manifest under the associate and additional statutes that every Andover professor must believe sincerely and be conscientiously convinced of the truth of these distinctive theological doctrines. . . . The plan for closer affiliation with Harvard is not compatible with the foundation of the Andover Theological Seminary.

"The Andover Theological Seminary was established as a separate, distinct, and independent theological school. The instruments of gift which called it into being disclose no express or implied permission that it ever be consolidated with another kindred institution. . . . The joining of the seminary with another institution to form a non-denominational theological school is contrary to the avowed end and aim of the founders."

After calling attention to the fact that under the merger "no one can be and remain an Andover professor until appointed by the authorities of Harvard" the court continues:

"The independence of an educational institution is gone when its teachers must receive their final appointment from some outside authority. . . . Doctrinal and creedal requirements were of the essence of the purpose of the founders of the Andover Seminary. The founders looked forward to no such modifications. On the contrary the associate founders enjoined that every article of the creed 'forever remain entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration.' . . . These findings cannot abate or qualify the emphasis placed upon the Andover Creed and the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism in

the constitution and the associate statutes of the Andover Seminary."

THE STUDENT FELLOWSHIP FOR CHRISTIAN LIFE SERVICE

This organization runs back apparently to the Student Volunteer Convention at Indianapolis in 1922 when a group of young moderns demonstrated for new lines of action in the student movement. Its sponsors think of it as enlisting men for home activities as the Student Volunteer Movement for the foreign field. There seems, however, to be little call for the organization and less of weight back of it. Yet at a conference at Delaware Water Gap in April, 1924, it was actually received into association with the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Student Volunteer Movement and the Council of the Church Boards of Education in a five-fold "Continuation Committee."

Whether this is but one more Trojan-horse-full of modernists devised this time to break into the Student Volunteer and other established organizations remains to be seen.* Certainly its organ, *The Student Challenge,* is calculated to awaken the suspicion. Its office is *vis-a-vis* to that of the *Christian Century* on South Dearborn Street, Chicago, and one notes names from the *Christian Century's* staff as contributors; others, too, of the same flavor, John Haynes Holmes, Glenn Frank, Bruno Lasker, H. van Loon, Upton Sinclair, Professors Coe, Ellwood, and C. A. Beard.

The literature the Student Fellowship commended ["may be secured from any depository of the Methodist Book Concern"] includes the writings of Coe, Dewey, Soares, Fosdick, Wiggam's New Decalogue, Well's Outline. Also 18 volumes of the Christian Century Press "for potential ministers." The wildest revolt literature (Nietzsche, Bertrand Russell, Lewisohn, etc.), is pushed editorially. The Unitarians find the organ of the Fellowship a congenial medium for advertising and the Meadville Seminary, under the caption of The New Reformation, publishes a half page of inducements [ample scholarships,

fellowships for graduate study in Europe] to students to cast in their lot with this Unitarian institution.

The tone of the publication is of a piece with the literature it touts. One editorial speaks of "Well-meaning adults prodding young people into one or another 'sacred' vocation such as the ministry, the Y. M. C. A., the foreign mission field. Those young people who are alive to the challenge of the modern world are quite likely to turn away in disgust from the fervid emotionalism and musty religiosity of such efforts."

Another indulges in this blasphemous banter: "If a skeleton is dug up in Palestine in the near future which apparently dates from the first century A. D. and someone supposes it to be that of Jesus conclusive proof will be given by measurement showing the Nordic conformation of the skull. . . . "

Such is the organ of the Student Fellowship for Christian Life Service. Of the $18,455 which have been contributed to it [chiefly by denominational boards and friends] the students themselves contributed just $137.60. The "insurgents" of the Indianapolis Convention of whom the modernist press wrote so rapturously do not seem to take their new "movement" very seriously.